

Y4 .F 76/1: Un 35/4

1017

9314
F46/1
Un 35/4

REVIEW OF THE 1974 GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE UNITED STATES POSITION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

GOVERNMENT

DOCUMENTS

Storage

2 1975

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

FEBRUARY 4 AND 5, 1975

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

KSU LIBRARIES



✓
A11900 913895



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

48-890

WASHINGTON : 1975

Y A F 10/11/34

DOCUMENTS

APR 28 1957

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

THOMAS E. MORGAN, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, Wisconsin
WAYNE L. HAYS, Ohio
L. H. FOUNTAIN, North Carolina
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., Michigan
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania
DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana
LESTER L. WOLFF, New York
JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, New York
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
ROY A. TAYLOR, North Carolina
MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Massachusetts
LEO J. RYAN, California
CHARLES WILSON, Texas
DONALD W. RIEGLE, Jr., Michigan
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
HELEN S. MEYNER, New Jersey
DON BONKER, Washington

WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, Michigan
EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois
JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr., Alabama
J. HERBERT BURKE, Florida
PIERRE S. DU PONT, Delaware
CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr., Ohio
EDWARD G. BIESTER, Pennsylvania
LARRY WINN, Jr., Kansas
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
TENNYSON GUYER, Ohio
ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO, California

MARIAN A. CZARNECKI, *Chief of Staff*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

DONALD M. FRASER, Minnesota, *Chairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, New York
MICHAEL HARRINGTON, Massachusetts
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
PAUL FINDLEY, Illinois

ROBERT B. BOETTCHER, *Staff Consultant*
JEANNE M. SALVIA, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

	Page
Tuesday, February 4, 1975:	
Evans, Luther, president, World Federalist, U.S.A.	21
Morgenthau, Hans, professor, New School of Social Research in New York	18
Scali, Hon. John, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations.....	8
Wolff, Hon. Lester L., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.....	2
Wednesday, February 5, 1975:	
Ginn, Rosemary, chairman, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO...	56
Leonard, Hon. James, president, United Nations Association of the U.S.A.	52
Yost, Hon. Charles W., former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations..	47

APPENDIX

Statement of Hon. Philip M. Crane, a Representative in Congress from the State of Illinois.....	79
Statement of the American Jewish Congress on the 1974 General Assembly and the U.S. position in the United Nations.....	82
Statement of the executive committee of the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace.....	85
Article entitled "Clash of the 'Two Majorities'—Whose United Nations?" by Hon. Charles W. Yost, the New Republic, December 28, 1974.....	89
Article entitled "The United Nations Was Never More Relevant Than Today", by Hon. Charles W. Yost, Saturday Review, January 1975.....	92
Letter from Robert Y. Gromet, M.D., World Federal Authority Committee, to Congressman Donald M. Fraser, dated February 1, 1975.....	96
Material submitted by the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO:	
Non-Governmental Organization Membership in the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.....	97
Federal Government, State and local government and member-at-large membership in the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.....	99
Statement on Israel by Amadon Mahtar M'Bow, Director General of UNESCO	101
Statement entitled "What, in the U.S. Interest, Is Given Up in Our Refusal To Continue as a Member of UNESCO?".....	103

CONTENTS

100	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
101	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
102	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
103	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
104	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
105	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
106	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
107	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
108	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
109	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
110	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
111	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
112	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
113	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
114	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
115	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
116	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
117	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
118	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
119	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.
120	THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, FROM 1776 TO 1876, BY J. W. FULTON.

REVIEW OF THE 1974 GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE UNITED STATES POSITION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1975

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2 p.m. in room 2255 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Donald M. Fraser (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FRASER. Today the Subcommittee on International Organizations meets for the first of two hearings on a review of the 1974 U.N. General Assembly and the U.S. position in the United Nations.

Certain actions of the 1974 U.N. General Assembly became the subject of considerable controversy among Members of Congress last fall, reflecting the controversy that was apparent among the American people in general. These controversial actions included the Assembly's decision to allow participation by the Palestine Liberation Organization—the first time a delegation not representing a member government was accorded such treatment. Other actions were the denial of South Africa's Assembly seat and the adoption of a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. In each case the United States and other industrialized nations were outvoted by a wide margin which included the developing countries of the Third World. These actions were met with strong criticism in the United States, and led the U.S. representative at the U.N., Ambassador Scali, to warn the Assembly of the tyranny of the majority and that American support for the U.N. was eroding—in our Congress and among the people.

Controversy over the U.N. became intensified with a decision at the UNESCO General Conference in November which cut off support for that agency's regional programs in Israel on the grounds that Israel had ignored U.N. resolutions against altering the cultural character of Jerusalem. Congress reacted to this by voting, in the foreign assistance bill, to withhold voluntary contributions for UNESCO until the President certifies that UNESCO's activities have become fully consistent with the agency's educational, scientific, and cultural objectives.

The opening days of the 94th Congress seem to be a particularly appropriate time for this subcommittee to review both the actions of the recent U.N. General Assembly and the U.S. position in the U.N. system. We will be interested in learning more about the causes and

consequences of the controversial measures. But we also hope to take this opportunity to assess other activities of the U.N. and to examine U.S. interests in relation to them.

We are pleased to welcome four distinguished witnesses today to help us with our evaluation: Hon. Lester Wolff, our colleague in the House and in the Foreign Affairs Committee from the State of New York; Hon. John Scali, Permanent U.S. Representative to the United Nations; Prof. Hans J. Morgenthau of the City University of New York, and Dr. Luther Evans, president of World Federalists, U.S.A.

We are delighted to have all of the witnesses here. I know that our colleague will have other responsibilities, but if possible we would like to have you join us up here for as long as you are able to stay after your statement.

So we will first hear from our colleague, Lester Wolff, whose service on the Foreign Affairs Committee has been outstanding and who has recently become chairman of one of the newly reorganized subcommittees of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Wolff.

STATEMENT OF HON. LESTER L. WOLFF, A REPRESENTATIVE IN THE CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would first like to thank you for honoring my request that was made on the floor during the debate on the foreign aid bill that hearings be held to review the recent session of the United Nations and the relationship of the United States to that organization. In the past, I have strongly supported the U.N., though I did question the size of the U.S. financial contribution.

I want you to know that in my statement here, any resemblance of criticism of the United Nations does not reflect upon the gentleman sitting to my immediate left, our very able Ambassador to the United Nations who, I feel, has done an outstanding job there and has been very representative of the positions of all Americans.

Today, I and a large number of heretofore strong supporters of the U.N. find ourselves troubled by the actions the organization has taken. It is unreasonable for us to expect that the U.S. position will always prevail, but it is not too much for us to expect that the United Nations will follow its own charter and will act to increase the prospects for peace in the world.

In the past session, the U.N. did not live up to these most reasonable expectations. It acted in ways that not only left these expectations unfulfilled but did damage to the credibility and viability of the organization itself. In light of this, I felt that it was essential for us to reexamine our policies.

In line with that, my statement today is intended to be constructive rather than destructive of the organization.

I would like to recount and comment on some of the U.N. actions that have troubled me and other Americans. Perhaps the most obvious incident is the granting of observer status to the Palestine Liberation Organization and in permitting its leader, Yasir Arafat, to address the General Assembly.

The United Nations is, as its name implies, an organization of nations. The PLO is simply not a nation. It is the umbrella organization of a band of international terrorists who have no qualms over spilling the blood of innocents. It is an organization whose authority and existence are based on the indiscriminate use of terror in attacking civilians and avoiding military targets. It is an organization that has received worldwide attention not because of its respect for international law or for its attempts to bring peace, but for its trampling of that law and its efforts to destroy a member state of the U.N.

On November 10, 1974, Yasir Arafat announced that " * * * the goal of our struggle is the end of Israel, and there can be no compromises or mediation * * * We don't want peace—we want victory. Peace, for us, means Israel's destruction and nothing else." Contrast his words with these from the U.N. Charter " * * * to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." Despite the fact that the PLO operates in total violation of the goals of the U.N., the General Assembly saw fit to grant it observer status by a vote of 95-17-19.

After granting the PLO observer status, the General Assembly greeted Yasir Arafat with full ceremonial honors and permitted him to address the Assembly. Only one other nonmember has been granted this honor: His Holiness Pope Paul.

In addition to making a mockery of U.N. ideals, this recognition of the PLO presents a most dangerous precedent for the future. It makes terrorism legitimate. It shows that disregard for human life is an acceptable tactic in achieving one's goals. Instead of placing the world body in opposition to bloodshed, it encourages it. It is a clear statement to terrorist groups in the world that if they persist they can receive honor, rather than punishment, for their crimes.

The U.N. has an abysmal record on the whole matter of curbing terrorism. After the 1972 Munich massacre of the Israel Olympic team, Secretary General Waldheim personally suggested that the General Assembly should give the matter of terrorism high priority. This suggestion received far less than wholehearted approval and no steps were taken. In fact, between July 1968 and the end of 1973 there were 27 recorded incidents of Arab terrorism that received no action by the U.N. Terrorists receive accolades as freedom fighters and their victims, who are often women and children, are ignored by the U.N. and their deaths hailed by the organizations that perpetrate these crimes.

During the past session's debate on the entire question of the Middle East, a debate in which a significant number of nations seemed to indicate that a member state of the U.N. had no right to exist, Israel's right to reply to the charges and comments made was limited to a single speech, plus a 10-minute statement at the end of the day. This action was, in the recollection of many diplomats, unprecedented in the entire 29-year history of the U.N. This is a most serious matter. One of the major functions of the U.N. is that of acting as an arena for the interaction of nations' opinions. This action severely limited the exchange of opinion that is most beneficial to all parties in any dispute and, again, sets a very dangerous precedent for the future. It was not done because of the threat of an international form of "fili-

buster," but resulted from narrow-mindedness and disregard for fair play.

I would like to emphasize that my concern in this has two bases. One, I felt that the opinions represented by the majority of the nations were not conducive to peace. Beyond this, however, I am concerned over the precedent such freedom of speech curbs set for the entire U.N.

A further incident was the suspension of South Africa from the General Assembly. I wish to make it clear that I am in total opposition to the apartheid policies of South Africa, but, again, I feel that the action taken was improper, irresponsible, and injurious to the well-being of the entire U.N. system.

The United Nations Charter clearly states that a member "... may be suspended from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendations of the Security Council." In the case of South Africa, the Security Council did not make any such recommendation. Rather, the suspension proposal met with a triple veto. The legal counsel of the United Nations, at the 25th session of the Assembly, set forth a ruling that stated that "the participation in meetings of the General Assembly is quite clearly one of the important rights and privileges of membership. Suspension of this right through the rejection of credentials would not satisfy the requirements and would therefore be contrary to the Charter."

Despite this clear ruling, the General Assembly voted 91-22-19 to suspend South Africa from participation.

One of the objects of the U.N. is to bring persuasion to bear on its delinquent members. To suspend a nation from membership in the Assembly is to isolate it from the very forum from which the persuasion emanates and is totally antithetical to the goal. Suspension is a one-time blow to a nation's international standing; it is a one-shot expression of international protest, but once this "shot" is fired, the U.N. has no further hold on the delinquent nation and a subsequent resolution condemning that nation's activities will have even less effect than before.

This suspension is also a step away from the desirable goal of universal membership and sets a disturbing precedent for the future. By the parliamentary chicanery of refusing to accept a delegation's credentials, even though there can be no question as to the legitimacy of those credentials, the doorway is opened to suspending any nation that a mathematical majority wishes to express its pique at.

A further example of the U.N.'s irresponsibility in this session is in the exclusion of Israel from a regional group of UNESCO. This is an international agency dedicated to educational, scientific, and cultural goals. It has been, and should continue to be, nonpolitical in its operation. Yet, there is no question that its actions against Israel were politically based. Accordingly, the United States has chosen to halt aid to UNESCO until it returns to its proper role. This is a most appropriate response.

One of the concerns underlying all of the actions I have discussed is the hypocrisy that the U.N. has shown. The U.N. seems to be wearing a set of blinders; condemning activities in one nation, while ignoring similar or worse in other nations. The spectacle of Uganda, where

General Amin expelled all those of Asian ancestry and has people liquidated almost daily, solemnly condemning the racism in South Africa borders on the ludicrous. Thousands of Burundians were killed in 1972 and 1973, yet the U.N. remained silent. Amnesty International has accused more than 60 of the 125 member nations of UNESCO of using torture as an instrument of control over the past 10 years. The U.N. response was to withdraw its offer of its facilities to the organization.

Violations of human rights must be acted upon by the U.N., but the U.N. must serve all mankind and not act for political reasons.

The disturbing actions I have outlined were taken because a majority of the U.N.'s membership favored them. But, because each nation is given one vote, a two-third majority can be obtained from nations representing a scant 10 percent of the total population represented in the U.N. By virtue of this, the General Assembly has passed measures that do not conform to the realities of the world situation. A majority passes a resolution that requires the minority to make concessions. It must be remembered that the General Assembly cannot dictate solutions and any attempt to do so will be ignored if it is considered unreasonable by those it is directed against. If this is a recurring situation, and it has become one, the minority will treat these resolutions with less and less respect. Such actions by the General Assembly accomplish nothing. They only serve to undermine the respect that is essential for the U.N.

I would like to quote from then Secretary of State Rogers' statement in 1972. He said that "the voting dominance of U.N. forums by the developing nations brings certain distortions in the functioning of many multilateral institutions." This can cause the institution to adopt unrealistic budgets over the opposition of major contributors.

Now this problem becomes more acute when the minority contains members whose economic, military and political resources are, in all probability, equal to or greater than those of the majority.

To summarize, the General Assembly has acted irresponsibly; in violation of its own Charter, in violation of any standard of fairness, and has acted to promote conflict and divisiveness rather than promote conciliation. It has acted according to the whims of a majority of the members, a majority that does not accurately reflect the world political situation. The General Assembly has become a seriously flawed body and these flaws are shared by other U.N. agencies such as UNESCO and Ecosoc.

It is ironic that the voting bloc that now controls the United Nations and has such a major voice in the policies adopted takes such small interest in financing the U.N. The United States pays a full 25 percent of the U.N. regular budget. For 1975 this comes to \$81,268,780. The United States has but one vote.

On the other hand, the countries that constitute the Third World bloc and more than half of the U.N. membership are, for the most part, assessed at the minimum rate of 0.02 percent of the budget, or \$56,030 for 1975. Additionally, nearly 110 Third World and Soviet bloc nations are delinquent in some form of payment. The OPEC nations only pay a combined total of 1.28 percent of the total budget.

Drug abuse is a problem that afflicts a large number of nations

and the problem continues to grow. I would like to quote from Ambassador Bush's statement in 1972 when he spoke before the United Nations. He said,

My delegation wishes to point out once again that the work now being done by the United Nations in the field of international drug control must be reinforced and extended. We cannot solve this extremely grave and continuous problem without increased international cooperation such as the auspices of the United Nations.

In the New York University Journal of International Law and Politics in which they talk about the whole question of international drug traffic—and I would like to just quote one portion of this for the record—the abuse of dangerous drugs is not limited to the United States. It is a growing problem around the world. As such it is a credible topic for U.N. actions. The U.N. already has a Commission on Narcotics Abuse, an International Narcotics Control Board and a fund for drug abuse control.

This is a global concern with little regard for national borders. U.N. sanctions, like the economic boycott of Rhodesia, have the advantage of unifying significant . . . world support. U.N. action may also more effectively reach those drug-producing nations with which the United States has little contact and to which the United States gives foreign aid. If a determination of noncooperation in the suppression of narcotics traffic were made by a U.N. agency, the stigma of American . . . [interference] . . . would be removed. Domestic feathers would still be ruffled, but the United Nations, not the United States, would do the ruffling.

The U.N. Fund for Drug Abuse Control attacks this problem on a worldwide basis, yet of the \$13.6 million that has been donated to this fund since 1971, \$10 million, 74 percent, has come from the United States. Again the United States pays a disproportionate share in combating this problem of global import. We carry the brunt of the burden despite the fact that the United States does not produce any of the opium that is one of the principal components of this problem.

I have attached a full excerpt from the New York University Journal of International Law and Politics, which I would like to include in the record.

Mr. FRASER. Without objection it will be so included.

[Excerpt follows:]

But the abuse of dangerous drugs is not limited to the United States. It is a growing problem around the world. As such, it is a credible topic for United Nations action. The U.N. already has a Commission on Narcotics Abuse, an International Narcotics Control Board and a Fund for Drug Abuse Control. Drug abuse—like environmental destruction, ocean resources and economic development—is a global concern with little regard for national borders. U.N. sanctions, like the economic boycott of Rhodesia, have the advantage of unifying significant, though not necessarily unanimous, world support. U.N. action may also more effectively reach those drug-producing nations with which the United States has little contact and to which the U.S. gives no aid. If a determination of noncooperation in the suppression of narcotics traffic were made by a U.N. agency, the stigma of American dictation of the terms under which multilateral aid is granted would be removed. Domestic feathers would still be ruffled, but the United Nations, not the United States would do the ruffling.

Mr. WOLFF. This discusses this matter and its relationship to the U.N.

What we have, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, is contradiction. The nations that have joined together in these majorities and have made their position prevail do not support the institution

that they are now abusing. It is the United States, the American taxpayer, who has paid the lion's share of the U.N.'s expenses. We have financed the irresponsibility of the past session.

To continue as we have in the past would indicate our continued support for such irresponsibility. Accordingly, I urge a reduction in our contribution as a clear gesture of U.S. disapproval. Again, I would like to make it clear that I advocate such a reduction not because the U.S. position did not always prevail, but because the U.N. has violated its own charter and acted in ways to encourage world conflict rather than curb it.

In addition, in the upcoming review of the charter I urge that the U.S. delegation give consideration to a form of weighted voting system in the U.N. Such a system should consider a nation's population and economic base in determining the voting weight. The United States should also insist that the U.N. strictly adhere to article 24, paragraph 1 of the charter, which states that the Security Council will have the " * * * primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security * * * " These proposals, if implemented, would make the U.N. a more viable body, responding to the accurately reflected concerns of the world in a way that would insure that the support of the necessary powers is obtained.

In closing, I would like to note that while the United Nations has acted irresponsibly and improperly in all of the actions I have outlined, it did take many actions that show that it can act as a useful instrument for world peace. The United Nations can take pride in the Secretary General's effort on Cyprus and in the stationing of peace-keeping forces on that island and their continuation in the Middle East. However, these bright points are overshadowed by the others.

We must act to insure that irresponsibility does not continue and that the United Nations returns to an uncompromised role as a body devoted to conciliation between nations.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Mr. Wolff. That is a very forceful and very well put together statement, which I think sums up the concerns that have been expressed by many Members of the House and we certainly appreciate it.

What I would like to do, if there is no objection from the subcommittee, is to proceed through the panel before we get to questions, because otherwise I fear we won't leave an opportunity to get through the panel this afternoon.

Mr. WOLFF. If I might be excused for a little while, and I will come back and join the panel.

Mr. FRASER. Yes, we understand that you may have a conflict, but whenever you can be here, that will be fine.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Our second witness is the Ambassador to the United Nations. I would like to say in introducing him that those of us who have had an opportunity to work with him have been very impressed with his forthrightness and his efforts to make the United Nations work well and his efforts to represent the U.S. interests within the U.N. system. He has become a friend of many of us and we are pleased to have him here.

Mr. Scali.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN SCALI, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Ambassador SCALI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before this distinguished committee and renew my friendship with many of the distinguished gentlemen on the other side of the table who have become friends and whose views and suggestions I listen to with respect and whose friendship I hope to continue to merit.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to examine with you the balance sheet on the performance of the United Nations. As you already know, some developments at the United Nations in recent weeks and months have been most disturbing. They have aroused thousands of letters from many, many Americans who have written to me, as well as much editorial comment in the news media across the Nation. I expect you share these concerns and that you are also hearing from your constituents.

I brought along copies of the address I made in the General Assembly on December 6, 1974, on the performance of the General Assembly session that was then about to end. I also have available copies of a speech I made only last Wednesday to a Boston audience in which I look not only at the General Assembly, but at the entire U.N. system.

I offer these statements not because I am enamored of my own rhetoric, but because they represent the considered, continuing analysis and review that my staff and I are conducting.

Mr. FRASER. Without objection we will insert those statements as a part of the record of the hearing.

Ambassador SCALI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

What is the balance sheet on the United Nations? Let us look at the General Assembly, at the Security Council, and at the family of economic and social agencies which are part of the U.N. system.

Basically it is the General Assembly that has produced the most startling developments in the past 6 months. The 138 members of the General Assembly have equal votes, and there is no veto. About 100 of the 138 can be identified as Third World countries, developing countries, or nonaligned countries. The remainder includes states more or less aligned with the Atlantic community or with the Socialist bloc.

When the Third World closes ranks, it can easily mobilize the votes to invite an Arafat to address it, to exclude a member such as South Africa from participation, or to impose unfair restrictions on the Israeli delegation such as dictating the number of times it may speak on an issue of vital importance to its survival. All these things happened at the 29th General Assembly that ended just before Christmas.

In addition, the Assembly voted a "Charter of Economic Rights and Duties" in the form we could not support, although we had tried very hard up to the last minute to negotiate our differences with the charter's Mexican sponsors and their associates.

On the other side of the balance sheet, this same Assembly took measures to strengthen the United Nations' facilities for disaster relief, to improve the status of women, to encourage greater international cooperation in locating soldiers missing in action. It adopted

and activated recommendations of the World Food Conference and the World Population Conference, both strongly supported by the United States. It also rejected ill-advised, lopsided resolutions on Cambodia and Korea. Above all, it also provided funds and policy support for continuing the U.N. peacekeeping forces in the Middle East.

During the very same period, and going back to October 1973, in my view the Security Council has shown new effectiveness in the vital area of peace keeping. Many, including myself, regard peace keeping as the most important activity of the whole U.N. system. The United Nations gets little credit when outbreaks of violence are contained and virtually none at all when it is able to head off violence before it occurs.

The October 1973 war brought two new U.N. peace-keeping forces into the Middle East to help restore peace on the Egyptian and Syrian fronts. The Security Council has continued to show that at moments of gravest tension and danger it can be a critically important element in the world political order. In the Security Council, East and West, North and South, developed and developing, have debated seriously. They have worked together constructively and they have come up with practical results to problems of peace keeping in the real world.

Other U.N. programs and activities have been continuing with less attention from the general public. I refer to the whole range of U.N. activities in the fields of health, child care, food, disaster relief, human rights, and economic development. Many of these programs resulted from U.S. initiatives.

For example, we have promoted U.N. efforts to control narcotics, as Congressman Wolff has already eloquently indicated. We have moved to protect the environment, to determine how to manage the wealth in and at the bottom of the sea. We have noted a growing interest in human rights in the United Nations as in Congress, and we seek to improve the U.N.'s effectiveness in promoting human rights.

It is also worth remembering that the entire cost of all those United Nations programs I have mentioned works out to less than \$2 per American per year. Compare that figure to the \$2.2 billion authorized for aid to Israel alone at the height of the October war, and I think you will agree that international cooperation may be less dramatic than conflict, but it is also a great deal cheaper.

Unfortunately some of the specialized organs of the United Nations system have followed the example of the 29th General Assembly and succumbed to the temptation to politicize their work. You are all well aware of UNESCO's action toward Israel. I deplore this action as mainly a political reprisal against a member state—a trend which opens a dangerous path for the United Nations to follow.

I have said before that I don't have ready answers to all the problems of the United Nations. I hope these hearings can help produce new insights and new expressions of opinion that will help the executive branch in its current rethinking of our participation in the United Nations.

I have not hesitated to declare forthrightly in the General Assembly what the U.S. Government thinks about these recent developments. I am pleased that my statement of December 6 precipitated what is now

remembered as the great debate in which more than 50 delegations participated. This debate revealed a surprising degree of general agreement on two essential points.

First, that the United Nations exists to promote orderly change. Second, in our interdependent world it must accomplish this task through genuine dialog and constructive compromise. I am proud that the American statement could lead to this kind of constructive look at the United Nations by its own membership.

As we keep under critical review the pattern of our participation in the United Nations, it is my working hypothesis that the United Nations has never needed positive leadership and constructive participation by the United States more than it does today. I have never been one to call it quits when the going gets a little rough and I have no inclination to turn my back on the problems we face in the United Nations today.

I shall be seeking to help formulate new approaches by which we can reduce the area of confrontation and achieve constructive actions in the United Nations. We in America do not think our world is perfect and neither do the 138 nations represented in the U.N. We are not going to prevail on every issue regardless of our power and position.

But I believe that if we press our views vigorously in the forums of the United Nations, we can eventually achieve results acceptable to all. I feel deeply that we must try. Acceptable results, however, depend on a greater initiative and role by the moderates in the Third World. They must recognize that doctrinaire or one-sided proposals, put forward on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, promote confrontation and deadlock instead of conciliation.

The United Nations did not create the problems that confront our world. Rather, the recent actions of the United Nations which have caused such grave concern reflect the deeply held grievances of a wide array of developing countries. They are acting in response to some of the most critical issues of our time, those of the Middle East, of racism in southern Africa, of threatening starvation and of widespread poverty. Their actions may be unrealistic, but their frustrations arise from very real problems.

A new effort in the United Nations to achieve constructive compromise can, I believe, help moderate their extreme behavior. Only real progress on these fundamental issues, however, can prevent a heightening confrontation from eventually destroying the United Nations and undermining the hopes for world peace which that organization has embodied for over a quarter of a century.

I have told you of my general approach. Perhaps at this point it would be more useful to you if I listened to your views and responded to your questions.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Ambassador Scali's statement to United Nations and address to Massachusetts State Federation of Women's Clubs follow:]

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR JOHN SCALI, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN PLENARY, ON STRENGTHENING THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

DECEMBER, 6, 1974.

Last year the United States Delegation sought to call attention to a trend which we believed threatened the United Nations' potential as an instrument

for international cooperation. We were deeply concerned then over the growing tendency of this Organization to adopt one-sided, unrealistic resolutions that cannot be implemented.

Today, more than a year later, my Delegation feels that we must return to this subject because this trend has not only continued, but accelerated. Added to this, there is now a new threat—an arbitrary disregard of United Nations rules, even of its Charter. What my Delegation spoke of 12 months ago as a potential threat to this Organization, unhappily has become today a clear and present danger.

The United States Government has already made clear from this rostrum its concern over a number of Assembly decisions taken during the Sixth Special Session last Spring, and during the current Session. These decisions have dealt with some of the most important, the most controversial, and the most vexing issues of our day: the global economic crisis, the turmoil in the middle East, and the injustice in Southern Africa. I will not today discuss again our main concerns with each of these decisions. Rather, I wish to take this opportunity to discuss the more general question of how self-centered actions endanger the future of this Organization.

The United Nations, and this Assembly in particular, can walk one of two paths. The Assembly can seek to represent the views of the numerical majority of the day, or it can try to act as a spokesman of a more general global opinion. To do the first is easy. To do the second is infinitely more difficult. But, if we look ahead, it is infinitely more useful.

There is certainly nothing wrong with like-minded groups of nations giving voice to the views they hold in common. However, Organizations other than the United Nations exist for that purpose. Thus, there are Organizations of African States, of Asian States, of Arab States, of European States, and of American States. There are groups of industrialized nations, of developing nations, of Western and Eastern nations, and of non-aligned nations. Each of these organizations exists to promote the views of its membership.

The United Nations, however, exists not to serve one or more of these special interest groups while remaining insensitive to the others. The challenge of the United Nations is to meld and reflect the views of all of them. The only victories with meaning are those which are victories for us all.

The General Assembly fulfills its true function when it reconciles opposing views and seeks to bridge the differences among its Member States. The most meaningful test of whether the Assembly has succeeded in this task is not whether a majority can be mobilized behind any single draft resolution, but whether those States whose cooperation is vital to implement a decision will support it in fact. A better world can only be constructed on negotiation and compromise, not on confrontation which inevitably sows the seeds of new conflicts. In the words of our Charter, the United Nations is "to be a center for harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

No observer should be misled by the coincidental similarities between the General Assembly and a legislature. A legislature passes laws. The General Assembly passes resolutions, which are in most cases advisory in nature. These resolutions are sometimes adopted by Assembly majorities which represent only a small fraction of the people of the world, its wealth, or its territory. Sometimes they brutally disregard the sensitivity of the minority.

Because the General Assembly is an advisory body on matters of world policy, the pursuit of mathematical majorities can be a particularly sterile form of international activity. Sovereign nations, and the other international organs which the Assembly advises through its resolutions, sometimes accept and sometimes reject that advice. Often they do not ask how many nations voted for a resolution, but who those nations were, what they represented, and what they advocated.

Members of the United Nations are endowed with sovereign equality. That is, they are equally entitled to their independence, to their rights under the Charter. They are not equal in size, in population, or in wealth. They have different capabilities, and, therefore, different responsibilities, as the Charter makes clear.

Similarly, because the majority can directly affect only the internal administration of this Organization, it is the United Nations itself which suffers most when a majority, in pursuit of an objective it believes overriding, forgets that responsibility must bear a reasonable relationship to capability and to authority.

Each time this Assembly adopts a resolution which it knows will not be implemented, it damages the credibility of the United Nations. Each time that

this Assembly makes a decision which a significant minority of members regard as unfair or one-sided, it further erodes vital support for the United Nations among that minority. But the minority which is so offended may in fact be a practical majority, in terms of its capacity to support this Organization and implement its decisions.

Unenforceable, one-sided resolutions destroy the authority of the United Nations. Far more serious, however, they encourage disrespect for the Charter, and for the traditions of our Organization.

No organization can function without an agreed-upon framework of rules and regulations. The framework for this Organization was built in the light of painful lessons learned from the disastrous failure of its predecessor, the League of Nations. Thus, the United Nations Charter was designed to insure that the important decisions of this Organization reflected real power relationships, and that decisions, once adopted, could be enforced.

One of the principal aims of the United Nations, expressed in the Preamble of its Charter, is "to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors." The promise the American people and the peoples of the other founding nations made to each other—not as a matter of law, but as a matter of solemn moral and political obligation—was to live up to the Charter and the duly-made rules unless or until they were modified in an orderly, constitutional manner.

The function of all parliaments is to provide expression to the majority will. Yet, when the rule of the majority becomes the tyranny of the majority, the minority will cease to respect or obey it, and the parliament will cease to function. Every majority must recognize that its authority does not extend beyond the point where the minority becomes so outraged that it is no longer willing to maintain the covenant which binds them.

My countrymen have made a great investment in this World Organization over the years—as host country, as the leading financial contributor, and as a conscientious participant in its debates and negotiations and operational programs. Americans have loyally continued these efforts in a spirit of good faith and tolerance, knowing that there would be words spoken which we did not always like and resolutions adopted which we could not always support.

As the 29th General Assembly draws to a close, however, many Americans are questioning their belief in the United Nations. They are deeply disturbed.

During this 29th General Assembly, resolutions have been passed which uncritically endorse the most far-reaching claims of one side in dangerous international disputes. With this has come a sharply increased tendency in this Assembly to disregard its normal procedures to benefit the side which enjoys the favor of the majority, and to silence, and even exclude, the representatives of Member States whose policies the majority condemns. In the wake of some of the examples of this Assembly, the General Conference of UNESCO has strayed down the same path with the predictable consequences of adverse reaction against the United Nations. Innocent bystanders such as UNICEF already have been affected.

We are all aware that true compromise is difficult and time-consuming, while bloc voting is fast and easy. But real progress on contentious issues must be earned. Paper triumphs are, in the end, expensive even for the victors. The cost is borne, first of all, by the United Nations as an institution, and, in the end, by all of us. Our achievements cannot be measured in paper.

A strong and vital United Nations is important to every Member State, and actions which weaken it weaken us all, particularly the smaller and the developing nations. Their security is particularly dependent on a collective response to aggression. Their prosperity particularly depends on access to an open and expanding international economy. Their ability to project their influence in the world is particularly enhanced by membership in international bodies such as the United Nations.

In calling attention to the dangerous trends, I wish also to call attention to the successes of the United Nations during the past year.

United Nations members overcame many differences at the World Population Conference and the World Food Conference. There was also progress at the Law of the Sea Conference. There was agreement on programs encouraging States to maintain a population which they can feed, and feed the population which they maintain. As a result of these United Nations Conferences, the world community has at least begun to grapple with the two fundamental issues which

are central to any meaningful attempt to provide a better life for most of mankind.

In the Middle East a unique combination of multilateral and bilateral diplomacy has succeeded in halting last year's war and in separating the combatants. With goodwill and cooperation, the Security Council has renewed the mandate for the peace forces, allowing time for a step-by-step negotiating process to bear fruit. My Government believes that this negotiating process continues to hold the best hope in more than a quarter of a century for a just and lasting peace in that area.

On Cyprus, the Security Council, the Assembly and our Secretary General have all contributed to progress toward peace and reconciliation. Much remains to be done, but movement toward peace has been encouraged.

Perhaps the United Nations' most overlooked success of the past year resulted from the mission of the Secretary General's representative, Mr. Weckman-Munoz. This effort, which was undertaken at the request of the Security Council, succeeded in mediating a particularly dangerous border dispute between Iran and Iraq. This example of how to prevent a small conflict from blowing up into a much bigger war must rank among the United Nations' finest, if least heralded, achievements.

Thus, despite the disturbing trend toward the sterile pursuit of empty majorities, recent United Nations achievements demonstrate that this Organization can still operate in the real world in the interests of all its members. Unfortunately, failure and controversy are threatening to overshadow the record of successes. Its lapses, are long remembered and remain a source of lasting grievance for those who feel wronged.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to say a few words, not as the United States Representative to this Organization, but as an American who has believed deeply in the United Nations since 1945 when, as a young reporter just returned from the war, I observed the birth of this Organization.

I must tell you that recent decisions of this Assembly, and of other United Nations bodies, have deeply affected public opinion in my country. The American people are deeply disturbed by decisions to exclude Member States, and to restrict their participation in discussions of matters of vital concern to them. They are concerned by moves to convert humanitarian and cultural programs into tools of political reprisal. Neither the American public nor the American Congress believe that such actions can be reconciled with the spirit or letter of the United Nations Charter. They do not believe that these decisions are in accord with the purposes for which this Organization was founded. They believe the United Nations, in its forums, must show the same understanding, fair play and responsibility which its resolutions ask of individual members.

My country cannot participate effectively in the United Nations without the support of the American people, and of the American Congress. For years they have provided that support generously. But I must tell you honestly that this support is eroding—in our Congress and among our people. Some of the foremost American champions of this Organization are deeply distressed at the trend of recent events.

A majority of our Congress and our people are still committed to a strong United Nations. They are still committed to achieving peaceful solutions to the issues which confront this Organization, in the Middle East, in South Africa, and elsewhere. They are still committed to building a more just world economic order. But the trends and decisions of the past few months are causing many to reflect and reassess what our role should be.

I have not come to the General Assembly today to suggest that the American people are going to turn away from the United Nations. I believe that World War II taught Americans the tragic cost of standing aside from an organized international effort to bring international law and justice to bear on world problems. But, like every nation, we must from time to time reassess our priorities, review our commitments, and redirect our energies. In the months ahead, I will do all in my power to persuade my countrymen that the United Nations can return to the path the Charter has laid out and that it can continue to serve the interests of *all* of its members.

If the United Nations ceases to work for the benefit of *all* of its members, it will become increasingly irrelevant. It will fade into the shadow world of rhetoric, abandoning its important role in the real world of negotiation and compromise.

We must join to prevent this. The reasons for which this World Organization was founded remain as valid and as compelling today as they were in 1945. If anything, there is added reason; the specters of nuclear holocaust, world depression, mass famine, over-population and a permanently ravaged environment.

If we are to succeed, we must now renew our commitment to the central principles of tolerance and harmony upon which the United Nations Charter was built. We must redouble our efforts to use this Organization as the world's ultimate instrument for compromise and negotiation.

I pledge my nation to these efforts.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR JOHN SCALL, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, AT THE MEETING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS STATE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS IN BOSTON, MASS.

JANUARY 29, 1975.

At the opening of this decade we Americans had already started to think of ourselves as a nation in perpetual crisis. And today our world still seems to be changing too fast for comfort. Our children come home from school with some curious ideas and sometimes behave in ways that are difficult to understand. Many of our most cherished values and ideals have been questioned, analyzed and assaulted. Our sweet land of liberty has become a sweet land of liberation movements. Women's lib was one of these, and adjustment didn't always come easy. These social problems are real, important and continuing.

In the international arena, new, unexpected problems have erupted to challenge us even as we seek answers to the old ones. The painful memory of Vietnam is reviving at the same time trouble spots like the Middle East and Cyprus threaten the peace of the world. New crises of food and energy were only prophecies a few years ago. Today they are realities and have sent shock waves through the economies of the world. In the last 12 months alone, \$60 billion of new profits have poured into the treasuries of oil producing countries under the label of petrodollars. This economic earthquake has coincided with drought, food shortages and crop failures in many areas of the world. Along with this have come sharply increased inflation and unemployment in the United States and other countries.

This unnerving combination of economic and political developments has led some to advocate a new economic order for the world and related changes in the old political order.

Nowhere has the cry for a new economic and political order in this world of growing interdependence been louder than in the forums of the United Nations. The glass palace of the United Nations is sometimes a distorted mirror. Generally, however, it reflects all too clearly the stresses and strains, the frustrations and the crises of the entire world community.

In its brief 28-year history, the U.N. ranks as still too modest an element in the world community to warrant the blame for developments it did not cause and cannot magically dispel. Nevertheless, among our other frustrations, the shortcomings and failings of the United Nations have recently attracted more attention than at any time in the past decade. Statesmen, public opinion leaders and mass communications media have found much to criticize in the United Nations during the past year. Some of this criticism has been exaggerated. Some of it has been unjust. But much of it, I submit, has been well-deserved.

Supporters of the United Nations are always quick to point out that while this Organization's occasional failings receive widespread press and public attention, its many solid accomplishments go largely unnoticed. Basically, I agree. I know that whenever I criticize the United Nations, I may add to this problem for the short term. I also know, however, that one cannot improve an institution by talking only about its strong points. One must give credit where it is due—as I hope I have—but only a frank and open discussion of an Organization's weaknesses can help to correct them.

The mounting critique of the United Nations in this country reflects a number of real concerns and poses some legitimate questions. In my view, those who dismiss the new criticism of the United Nations as complaints from fair-weather friends or disguised enemies seriously misread the mood of the American people. I continue to be a strong supporter of the United Nations. I also believe that it can benefit from constructive, reasoned criticism. The United Nations is strong enough to withstand such criticism, it is flexible enough to profit from it and it is important enough to justify it.

Last month I spoke to the General Assembly about a series of recent United Nations decisions which increasingly disturbed the United States Government. I deplored several actions by the Assembly which tended to inflame some of the world's most sensitive problems, rather than help solve them. On highly emotional issues like the invitation to Yasir Arafat to speak before the General Assembly, the suspension of South Africa and the current world economic situation, it is our view that the Assembly had adopted enormously controversial, partisan resolutions. Worse still, the majority bloc which passed these resolutions appeared willing to pursue their objectives in violation of the traditions and Charter of the United Nations. Constitutionalism went out the window while the Assembly voted to exclude South Africa. On some issues majorities seemed to forget that in a democracy a majority cannot safely push a minority too far.

My statement to the Assembly coincided with those of several Western European representatives who expressed concerns very similar to our own. Delegates from the Third World seemed surprised by this serious new criticism, but they quickly regrouped to respond.

Eventually delegates from 50 Member States representing all shades of world opinion rose to express their government's views in what developed into a "great debate". Some speakers agreed with us, while others did not. The exchange of views was vigorous, forthright, but generally without rancor. For several days the Assembly thus found itself engaged in a thoughtful and unprecedented examination of its future and that of the United Nations system. I am proud the United States was able to stimulate this long overdue debate.

Despite the wide range of opinion expressed, there was general agreement on the proposition that the fundamental purpose of the United Nations is to harmonize conflicting views as the Charter says and to promote orderly change. The wealthier nations naturally tended to emphasize the need for order. The Third World understandably placed its priority on the need for rapid change. Opinion in the Assembly certainly varied, but on this central issue the difference was one of degree, not of principle.

During this debate, all speakers seemed to agree that the United Nations functioned best through dialogue and negotiation. Coming at the end of an Assembly session marked by heightened confrontation, this widespread desire for greater dialogue was welcome. It was a welcome sign that others, too, realized that we were headed in the wrong direction.

In a farewell press conference as the Assembly ended, this year's Assembly President, Algerian Foreign Minister Bouteflika, added his voice to those calling for more dialogue between the Third World and older Member Nations. I share his wish, and I am genuinely pleased that my remarks of December 6 helped open the door to a greater and franker exchange within the Assembly. I intend in the coming months to do whatever I can to build on and enlarge the scope of this two-way exchange. The time has come to create a new spirit of constructive compromise in the United Nations. To do so, there will need to be less emphasis on rounding up bloc votes and more on accommodation and conciliation.

In the weeks ahead we will consult intensively with those expressing different as well as similar viewpoints. If such consultations are to be worthwhile, however, there must be a genuine dialogue. There must be a readiness to move from the initial position each side expresses. It is time we begin to talk to one another instead of at one another.

On too many occasions negotiations with the dominant Third World group of countries have not involved a sufficient degree of this necessary give and take. On many important issues the initial position of the Third World countries often turned out to be their final position. Failure to accept their unchanging stand was often regarded as a stubborn refusal to acknowledge how the world has changed. This created more confrontation than conciliation.

Although I have in my remarks today focused on some areas where we seek improvement of the United Nations, it is only fair that I note that in many ways the Organization has moved effectively, considering our complicated world.

It is worth remembering, for instance, that the same recent Session of the General Assembly which adopted decisions which alarmed the United States also approved the recommendations of the recent World Food Conference in Rome and of the World Population Conference in Bucharest. In so doing, the Assembly flexibly responded to worldwide demands for action on two issues fundamental to man's future on this planet.

This same Session of the Assembly took a number of other steps strongly supported by the United States. These included measures to strengthen the United Nations' facilities for disaster relief, to improve the status of women and to encourage greater international cooperation in locating soldiers missing in action. These programs join with United Nations efforts to control narcotics, protect the environment, determine who owns the wealth in and at the bottom of the sea.

This same Session provided funds for and renewed that mandate of United Nations Peacekeeping Forces in the Middle East. After lengthy debate, it rejected ill-advised, one-sided resolutions on Cambodia and Korea.

Even as press and public attention is irresistibly drawn to the verbal battle in the General Assembly, dedicated international civil servants are engaged in productive and vitally important United Nations work in fields such as health, child care, food, disaster relief, human rights and economic development. My colleague and friend, Patricia Hutar, spoke to you this morning about the pioneering efforts in the United Nations to improve the status of women. Let me, from my own experience, add still one more example of how quickly and effectively the United Nations can act, particularly in a crisis.

In October of 1973, at the height of the Yom Kippur war in the Middle East, the Security Council agreed to establish a new United Nations Emergency Force to help restore the peace. Within just a few hours of that decision, the first contingents of United Nations troops began arriving on the Sinai battle front. They moved quickly into the midst of the fighting to separate the combatants. Within a few days this Force had brought about the cease-fire which was an indispensable prelude to negotiation. This cease-fire remains in effect today.

This delicate and dangerous task required cooperation, courage, discipline and the kind of experience in peacekeeping which only the United Nations has. Can you imagine the time, the effort and additional crises that would have been necessary to create anything resembling this impartial Force if the United Nations had not existed, ready to act as the respected emergency peacekeeper of the world? Indeed, could such a Force have been created in time if the United Nations did not exist? The visible success of the blue-helmeted troops in the Middle East reflects highly not only on these officers and men who serve but also on the United Nations Secretariat in New York which so effectively organized, directed and maintains them in place.

I began my remarks by noting that there has been a growing criticism of the United Nations in this country. I also said that much of this criticism is justified. The question is what are we going to do about it?

I do not have any pat answers to this question. Our Government is reviewing our policies toward the United Nations. I hope that through this review we can develop some new approaches to these difficult issues. I cannot forecast the results. I start out with the premise that you do not solve a problem by walking away from it. Frank criticism can help curb irresponsible behavior, but it must be combined with responsible, imaginative leadership if it is to have a positive impact on our search for peace and a better world.

In an Organization of 138 member nations, the United States cannot expect to prevail on every issue, regardless of our power and position. But as long as we press our views vigorously, while recognizing we do not possess a monopoly of the world's wisdom, the result eventually can be an acceptable compromise of conflicting views.

There are some who feel that when the United Nations acts contrary to United States interests, we should simply turn our back upon it, or even withdraw. I am not one of these.

Without the United States, the United Nations would persist. Only it would be worse, not better. If we could erase the United Nations from the pages of history—and we cannot—there would inevitably be a new Organization because interdependence is an incontrovertible fact of our times. It is growing rather than lessening. It means that the United States cannot advance its own interests single-handedly, but only in concert with other nations, because the solutions demand action by the United States and others working together.

Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, whose diplomatic achievements have eased tensions around the world, sketched the dimensions of the problems confronting us in these words in an interview January 16:

One of the central facts of our period is that more than a hundred nations have come into being in the last 15 years, and they, too, must be central participants in this process. So that for the first time in history foreign policy has become truly global and therefore truly complicated.

"... We are at a watershed. We are at a period which in retrospect is either going to be seen as a period of extraordinary creativity or a period when really the international order came apart—politically, economically, and morally.

"I believe that with all the dislocations we now experience, there also exists an extraordinary opportunity to form for the first time in history a truly global society, carried by the principle of interdependence. And if we act wisely and with vision, I think we can look back to all this turmoil as the birth pangs of a more creative and better system."

To exercise positive leadership in the United Nations, our people must join together in support of a truly national foreign policy. The United States must be able to speak with one voice. Our leaders must be able to enter into meaningful discussion with their foreign colleagues and these foreign statesmen must be confident that the American people stand behind their leaders.

We must also recognize that America often leads best by example. Thus, our success in solving our economic and social difficulties at home strengthens our voice around the negotiating table. Our willingness to accept sacrifices and inconveniences in meeting the world's energy crisis will be viewed as a test of our leadership of the free world. The truth evident in our world today is that a vigorous domestic policy and an active international role depend heavily on each other for success. Thus, only a combination of national and international action can solve global problems like inflation, rising unemployment and shortages of food, energy and other key resources.

I believe America is ready to do what it must do—at home and internationally—both within and outside the United Nations. Even the most vigorous and imaginative American leadership cannot guarantee success, but a half-hearted America can insure defeat.

Reversing the current trend toward division and confrontation in the United Nations does not depend on our efforts alone. I am convinced, however, that we must walk the extra mile to overcome suspicion. We are not the guardians of the status quo. We are proud of our heritage as a revolutionary country which seeks to promote freedom. Some may question whether the flame of liberty burns as bright as we approach our 200th birthday. We must demonstrate by our actions that we remain dedicated not only to freedom, equality and human dignity but to a more just world. I have pledged the United States to seek to promote this new spirit of constructive compromise in the United Nations. Others must join us.

As Britain's Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Ivor Richard, said in his address before the annual meeting of the Pilgrims of the United States in New York January 22:

"Our task is to show that the interests of the developed and the developing are complementary, not antagonistic. All must understand the realities which limit the possibilities for action, and all must make a deliberate attempt to find the common interest and act on it to a point where all can see that they gain as well as give."

Ambassador Richard has pointed out the only path to a truly effective United Nations, one which can serve all members, regardless of size, wealth or aspirations.

It is not the radical extremists of the right or the left who will draw the blueprint of tomorrow's more just world order. There are thoughtful, responsible representatives at the United Nations from every continent and in every grouping. We must join our own efforts to the wisdom and energy of these individuals to pursue this goal—and in so doing revitalize the Organization.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. Your statement is very helpful and very forthright. I may add that our subcommittee particularly appreciates the fact that you rushed from the visit out of town to be with us today. We thank you for your special consideration.

Our next witness is Prof. Hans Morgenthau of the New School for Social Research in New York. I might add that Professor Morgenthau has been known to many of us as a realist in foreign policy and as such he is to provide guidance for many of us who are in some very critical years.

We are delighted to have you with us, Professor.

STATEMENT OF HANS MORGENTHAU, PROFESSOR, NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH IN NEW YORK

Mr. MORGENTHAU. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, when Secretary of State Cordell Hull reported to Congress on the Moscow Conference of 1943, he declared that once the United Nations was established "there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balance of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which, in the unhappy past, the nations strove to safeguard their security or promote their interests."

Echoing these expectations, President Franklin D. Roosevelt told Congress on March 1, 1945, in his report on the Yalta Conference:

The Crimean conference . . . spells the end of the system of unilateral action and exclusive alliances and spheres of influence and balances of power and all the other expedients which have been tried for centuries—and have failed. We propose to substitute for all these a universal organization in which all peace-loving nations will finally have a chance to join.

These expectations were disappointed, as they were bound to be. The United Nations, far from being a substitute for traditional power politics, has become a new arena on which the old game of power politics is played out within a new institutional framework and under new rules of procedure. It is, therefore, not surprising but it was inevitable that all member states and groups of member states would try to use the United Nations to protect and promote their particular national interests.

The United States did this during the first decade of the United Nations, when it and its allies dominated the Security Council and General Assembly. The so-called Third World nations are doing this today with the support of the Soviet bloc. The drastic change in the membership, which has more than doubled in the last two decades, and shifts in the distribution of economic and political power are reflected in the policies of the United Nations and the voting behavior of its members.

If this were the whole story, the United States would have no legal or moral reason to complain. It would be entitled to regret the trend of events adverse to its preferences and interests and use the provisions of the charter to oppose it, as the Soviet Union did when it vetoed 109 resolutions of the Security Council with which it disagreed. However, two new factors sharply distinguish the situation in which the United Nations finds itself today from the one that prevailed when the influence of the United States was dominant.

In the latter situation the voting bloc dominated by the United States reflected in considerable measure the actual distribution of power in the world. A vote of the General Assembly reflected the interests, and was supported by the power, of a substantial segment of the world community.

Today the core of a typical voting majority of the General Assembly is composed of mini-states who are lacking in all or most attributes of nationhood, who enjoy the semblance of sovereignty only by courtesy of the world community, and who could not exist even in their present precarious state without foreign subsidies. Their votes in the

General Assembly do not represent, as such, a substantial interest of the world community, nor are they supported by anything even faintly approaching substantial power.

Resolutions which owe their main support to these mini-state votes are either nothing more than rhetorical proclamations without tangible consequences or they serve the purposes of other powerful states or groups of states, such as the Soviet and Arab blocs, who pay for the voting support of the mini-states with economic and political aid.

The other new factor in the present situation is the ruthless use, frequently oblivious of moral restraints and legal rules, which the new majority has made of its power within the United Nations. The General Assembly has passed for years, resolutions of dubious legality or obvious illegality. The suspension of South Africa by the General Assembly of 1974 is but the latest and most spectacular of a long string of resolutions subordinating respect for fair play and the provisions of the charter to whatever political advantage can be extracted from the arbitrary use of voting power. That use is typically justified by the violation of moral principles by a particular nation, in this case the South African policies of racial discrimination.

The issue which is raised by this particular vote does not concern the moral quality of the South African racial policies, but the moral authority of the General Assembly to pass such a moral judgment at all.

It is a general moral, as well as legal principle, that the complainant in such a case must come with clean hands, that is, that he must not be guilty of the same or worse contraventions he complains of. Yet if the majority of the General Assembly finds racial discrimination morally unacceptable, how can it accept as members of the collective tribunal, states which are guilty not only of racial discrimination but of genocide as public policy?

We are here in the presence of a moral perversion which authorizes states guilty of moral outrages of the first order to condemn and punish other states guilty of a lesser contravention. Similarly, what is the moral and legal position of a majority of the General Assembly, who as members of the United Nations are committed to the sovereign equality of all member states and who receive with thunderous applause the address of the head of the PLO, proclaiming his resolution to destroy the state of Israel?

What, in the practices of the General Assembly, appears as moral perversion, manifests itself in the staffing practices of the Secretariat as a spoils system, pure and simple, without any moral pretense whatsoever. It was, of course, an illusion to expect that the international civil servant employed by the United Nations could transcend by an act of will the limits of his nationality in the form of values, loyalties, ways of thinking, and acting.

There is, however, a fundamental difference between an international civil servant trying, in spite of these national limitations, to serve the international organization which employs him, and an international civil servant who openly and without reservation attempts to use his position for the purposes of his nation or a particular bloc of nations.

The national composition of the Secretariat of the United Nations shows, as of summer 1974, a disproportion in favor of the Arab bloc

of nations, which cannot be considered to be accidental. That is particularly true of Egypt, Syria, Sudan, Tunisia, Iraq, and Lebanon. The representation of Egypt is 238 percent above what it ought to be in view of objective criteria, the excess for Syria is 66 percent; for Sudan, 83 percent; for Tunisia, 66 percent; for Iraq, 71 percent; and for Lebanon, 50 percent.

It stands to reason that these disproportions in favor of the members of a particular bloc are not likely to be accidental. That conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the Division of Personnel of the Secretariat is dominated by representatives of the same bloc: the Director of Personnel, with the rank of Under Secretary General, the Deputy Director of Personnel and the special assistant to the Director of Personnel are Arabs.

If one combines this extreme disequilibrium in the composition of the Secretariat with the moral perversion which has come to the fore in the General Assembly of 1974, one realizes to what extent the United Nations has not only become the political instrument of certain blocs of nations, but has for all practical purposes ceased to represent the collective will of its membership according to the provisions of the charter.

This decline of the United Nations faces the United States with a dilemma. The United Nations, as presently operating, has become an instrument of certain blocs of nations who use it on behalf of their interests without regard for legal niceties and moral restraints. As such, it neither contributes to the preservation of peace nor does it support the interests of the United States. On the other hand, the nations of the world need an international organization which is able not only to contribute to the preservation of peace by mitigating international conflicts, but also to aid in the solution of problems whose causes and effects transcend the limits of the nation state.

The United Nations and its specialized agencies have, within rather narrow limits, performed worthwhile tasks in these two major areas of their competence. For instance, while there is no evidence that the United Nations has prevented any war, there is unmistakable evidence to show that it has materially contributed to the shortening of four wars: Indonesia in 1949, Palestine in 1949, Egypt in 1956, and Kashmir in 1965.

In view of the degeneration of the United Nations, it is tempting to write off its past achievements and future potentialities and reconcile oneself to the realization of the prophecy the late Secretary General U Thant made in 1965:

We are witnessing today, I feel, a definite reversal of the slow progress the United Nations has made toward world stability and world peace. A further drift in this direction, if not arrested in time, will mark the closing of a chapter of great expectations and the heralding of a new chapter in which the world organization will provide merely a debating forum and nothing else.

However, at least for the time being the United States ought to resist that temptation. For not only does the United States have an interest in the proper operation of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, but it has also considerable potential power to influence these operations. The elements of that power are essentially threefold. The United States still disposes of a substantial reservoir of good

will, the accumulated capital of its past aspirations and achievements. The United States is still a very powerful Nation to whose power many nations owe much and from whose power they expect much.

More particularly, the United States is a financial mainstay of the United Nations and many of its specialized agencies and ought to be able to translate this financial position into political influence and power. The United States ought to consider seriously the withdrawal of its support from the United Nations only after its reform through the use of American power and influence has definitely failed.

Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Professor Morgenthau. That was a very helpful statement.

Our final witness this afternoon is Dr. Luther Evans, president of the World Federalists, U.S.A. I may add that we are especially pleased to have you here, Dr. Evans, on behalf of an organization that shares a lot of the responsibility for carrying on a public information and education program about the U.N. system.

I understand that you are proposing to summarize part of your statement.

STATEMENT OF LUTHER H. EVANS, PRESIDENT, WORLD FEDERALISTS, U.S.A.

Mr. EVANS. That's right, sir.

Mr. FRASER. Fine. Why don't you proceed.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, most of what I have put in my statement has been covered in one way or another by one or more of the other speakers. I am impressed by the achievements of the United Nations and also of the specialized agencies. I am also impressed by the handicaps they have suffered in the past, by the refusal of many countries, including the United States and other great powers and middle powers, to take seriously some of the grievances of the world which the United Nations might have attempted to do more about.

They have not taken seriously the provisions of the charter regarding disarmament and they have not taken very seriously the provision of the charter regarding the establishment of peace forces, the military arrangements. They have not taken very seriously the question of aid to underdeveloped countries. They have adopted great declarations of aid, but the amount of aid that they have given has been very small compared to the amount that was needed. And I think a lot of the problems we face today come from an extreme expression on the part of the less developed countries of a sense of injustice and a sense of defeat, a sense of hopelessness at the failure of the great powers and the other developed countries to take measures to improve their lot.

They have been the victims of imposed low prices for raw materials. They have been the victims of increasingly high prices for the manufactured goods they must buy from the advanced countries. They have suffered from trade arrangements which do not allow them to have equal import rights with developed countries when it comes to manufactured and semimanufactured goods. They have been discontented

with the fact that the great powers and Israel have not carried out the Security Council resolution of 1967.

They believe that the United States and Soviet Union are guilty of many of the problems in that area by arming both sides and supporting them for political reasons of their own rather than in the interests of the people who live in the area.

I do not approve of the things which have been the objects of criticism of the United Nations and UNESCO at this meeting, but I do think that we must take into account more seriously than we have done the demand of many countries for a new economic and social order, which is supported by the way by a good many of the advanced countries as indicated at the Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations which met last April.

I believe that the PLO is not a state, but also that the powers have not satisfied the demands made in all of the great documents of the Security Council respecting the rights of the refugee Palestinians. I believe we will have to do more to respect these rights, and I recommend that Arafat's group be represented at the peace conference in Geneva.

I believe that our Government should support the creation of a West Bank state for these people. And I do not deny the right of other Palestinians to be represented at the peace conference. I think as long as powerful states do not take seriously some of the objectives of the charter, these people are not going to take seriously our charges that they are breaking up our system of international law and government.

We must, as Mr. Scali says, negotiate with them. We must try to reduce the confrontation. And I believe as we take seriously their point of view, listen to them, try to meet their demands, they will moderate their own demands and behavior. For instance, Mr. Arafat's representative told a group in London recently that the Arab states, would, in his opinion support the establishment of a West Bank Palestinian state as sufficient recognition of the demands of Mr. Arafat and would not go with him the rest of the way to destroy Israel as a Jewish state.

One word about UNESCO. I have a three-page statement here explaining what happened in UNESCO. The general view of what happened, particularly about the old city of Jerusalem, is inaccurate and the general view of how Israel was excluded from the regional European group of states is also generally inaccurate.

The UNESCO had protested for years since 1968 about excavations in the city of Jerusalem. The executive board decided in 1974, with only three Arabs on the Board, to condemn Israel for what it was doing and its proposed resolution was the one that was passed at the General Conference. It was an act of a body with very small Arab representation, and did not result from an Arab-inspired political campaign.

In the matter of depriving Israel of funds—only \$24,000 was appropriated in 1973-74—the Conference decided not to contribute any funds in 1975-76 unless Israel comes into compliance with what the Conference had decided in 1972, and repeated in 1974.

Mr. Chairman, it is irresponsible in my opinion to talk about abandoning the United Nations. I think the lesson is that we must take our obligations under the charter much more seriously. These people

who are causing concern will not go away just by depriving them of the U.N. as an area in which to operate. The problems will grow worse if they are not dealt with through the mechanism of the United Nations and the specialized agencies.

I think that is enough for me to say at this time, Mr. Chairman, except that I would like to call attention to a statement which has been submitted to the committee by the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. This statement deals with the whole question before us. I believe that copies have reached the committee, and I merely wish to say that I was asked by the chairman to speak a word of endorsement of it. I was chairman of the executive committee which drafted the statement, and think it is a very good one.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Dr. Evans. Is it your thought that you would like that last report incorporated as part of your statement?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I assume that this has been received and that Dr. Sohn has requested that it be put in the hearings. I merely was going to endorse it, but I think it would be quite relevant to include it as a document.

Mr. FRASER. Without objection—

Mr. EVANS. They have requested that, and I would like to endorse the request.

Mr. FRASER. Your entire written statement will be put in the record together with that document as well.

[Prepared statement of Dr. Luther H. Evans follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. LUTHER H. EVANS, PRESIDENT OF WORLD
FEDERALISTS, U.S.A.

Chairman Fraser; Chairman Hamilton; Members of the Subcommittees: I am Luther Evans, President of World Federalists, U.S.A. I am here today to speak in behalf of the World Federalists, but also with some reflection of my service from 1953 to 1958 as Director-General of UNESCO—the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. And I shall also try to apply to my comments some of the understanding of your concerns and interests which I obtained as a result of my term from 1945 to 1953 as your Librarian of Congress.

The issues of United States participation in the United Nations and in UNESCO are best appreciated if viewed in the context of a half century of prolonged effort to save humankind from war. The United States has in a very real sense been the leader of this effort, though it refrained from full participation in the first two decades, and has been somewhat inconstant in the remaining three decades.

It must be admitted by everyone, I believe, that without the leadership of President Wilson to construct an organization to prevent war, the League of Nations would not have been born at the end of World War I, and also that without the leadership of President Roosevelt the United Nations in its eventual form would probably not have been created at the end of World War II. It seems clear that the United States had more of a belief than other great powers that a new effort to prevent war was worthwhile, and that conflicting ideals and ambitions could be sufficiently reconciled to make such a creation more powerful and comprehensive than the League ever was. In this we were supported strongly by small countries and more or less reluctantly by others.

A prevailing assumption of the day was that the victorious great powers—those given the permanent seats on the Security Council—would agree on most things of great importance and act in the common interest in keeping the peace. After all, they were allies in the greatest military conflict of human history. This assumption has not proved out fully in practice, with cold war and limited détente. Herein lies a main source of conflict and strife in the world of today.

One of the more marked changes from the League which we see in the U.N. and its allied organizations is found in the enormous range of their concern in human affairs, including such matters as food, health, education, trade, monetary relations, economic and social development, labor, full employment, human rights, promotion of science and technology, aviation, weather, communications, copyrights, patents, cultural affairs, historical preservation, and applied research, as well as disarmament, peacekeeping, the development of self-government in colonial lands, etc.

While the range of concerns is great, the depth of power is not. These agencies provide mostly a location and mechanism for studying matters of common concern, debating what should be done, deciding to reach agreements on particular matters . . . but not often by applying sovereign power against anyone, particularly against anyone who doesn't agree to new arrangements. In many of these areas of activity many notable things have been achieved. Humankind is much more a community than before, and the makings are present that could be used to create a real world society.

The fly in the ointment is that the will to cooperate has not been strong enough; mutual appreciation of problems of others has not been strong enough; but short-range demands of national or group interest have been altogether too strong. All of this has been made worse by a general failure to see clearly that the world as a whole has been heading for disaster in matters of population growth, resource depletion, and environmental deterioration. Add to this the revolution of rising expectations, particularly by the more disadvantaged portions of humanity, and the failure of the advantaged portions to respond adequately . . . and we encounter a world coming apart at the seams.

Further compounding our dilemma is the lack of a sense of urgency in solving numerous national grievances in Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and elsewhere; reaction to this insensitivity is now expressed in the strident and extreme demands which are beyond the capacity of the international machinery of cooperation to manage.

A particular tragedy of America's perspective on the world has always been our willingness to shut out dissent . . . to close our eyes and block our ears to disagreement. It has always been easier to ignore the opinions of others than to accommodate them within our own national policies. The United Nations serves most of all as a concentration of world opinions; it is a place to hear and be heard. It can only serve our best advantage if we listen, and if we attempt to respond. It can only harm us if we attempt in any way to shut off the forum, or to ignore the voices. It would do us no good to take measures to restrict free expression at the United Nations.

The simple fact is that the 1974 General Assembly was a more perfect mirror of the state of the world and the discontent of its peoples than we have before had available.

Recent events are expressions of frustration over continuing conflicts and the failure of the organized community to adequately respond to human suffering and repression. The economically disadvantaged came together in the Special General Assembly last spring to demand a new economic order, as they had in UNCTAD conferences at which they demanded a better deal in trade and financial relations. Certain countries have found the weapon of oil prices and the boycott as tools for a better bargain, and used the Middle East crisis to force the point home. The nearly 30-year old problem of unsatisfied demands on behalf of the Palestinians afforded the steam for the Arafat spectacle; the problem of a feeble policy against apartheid led to the radical acts against South Africa.

Do I approve the breaches thus made evident? No, I do not. I merely say that they have understandable origins, and that those origins must be dealt with . . . or the manifestations will be repeated, and continue to compound the world's difficulties.

What is the wise policy for nations to pursue? I believe they should elevate their sights and look more closely at the ways they should act in recognition of their growing interdependence: the advantaged nations should recognize how dependent they have been on taking advantage of less-advantaged nations, and they should genuinely negotiate with them in finding a new balance between national interests on both sides, and with world interests; and the disadvantaged nations should realize that they sometimes have unrealistic views of what aspirations it is possible to realize in a brief span.

Certain conflicts, such as the Middle East, must be dealt with at once, along lines already laid down as long ago as 1967; détente must be supported and

strengthened; the armaments race must be halted—and soon reversed; and genuine negotiations must proceed on all the great problems which today afflict humankind . . . including food scarcities, population pressures, energy shortages, anarchy of the seas, economic disparity and instability, arms proliferation and trafficking, political repression, etc.

Our interests in the United Nations will not be best served by threats and actions to cut off funds, to lessen cooperation, to withdraw; such measures are self-defeating aberrations, advocated by persons who are either not interested in or not very knowledgeable about the obligations all of us must fulfill if we are to create a workable human order on earth. We must not only cherish the institutions we already have, but strengthen them, and indeed create new agencies or sub-agencies to deal with the myriad of problems which we are only now beginning to recognize. Our will must be strengthened also to obey the laws and agreements already on the books, since disrespect of the obligations of law is growing in international affairs as in domestic affairs, and the United States participates in this portentous evil.

[May I take this opportunity to express our highest commendations to Chairman Fraser and Congressman Buchanan—and the many other members of the subcommittees and the House—for their steadfast determination to right the wrong of United States violation of United Nations Sanctions against Rhodesia. The most fundamental principles of respect for international law hang in the balance on this issue. You may be sure that World Federalists, U.S.A. stands with you.]

Our national security cannot be guaranteed by arms, no matter how devastating or ingenious. It can be made more certain with far more modest armed strength if accompanied by a more convincing respect for our common interests, a more consistent reliance on the institutions we have built for our mutual benefit, and a more determined commitment to exploring new avenues for the resolution of common problems.

These hearings have been convened to examine the controversies which characterized the past year's sessions of the General Assembly and the General Conference of UNESCO. But I suggest to you today that there is little to be gained by prolonging the controversy and uncertainty of the year which is past. Let's look instead to what we can do now. In the final analysis, the value of the United Nations and other international machinery can be judged only on what it accomplishes . . . and accomplishment can come only as the product of initiative. I suggest to you that we can turn the world's attention from the petty politics of who gets a big white chair to creating new approaches to relieving human suffering and averting war.

Even in a year so marked by controversy and disagreement as 1974, the accomplishments of the United Nations were far from insubstantial:

The U.N. maintained an effective peacekeeping operation in the Middle East during repeated resurgences of tension and even frequent outbreaks of isolated hostilities;

The U.N. renewed its peacekeeping operations on Cyprus, and employed its forces with distinction to lessen the effects and intensification of open combat on a newly-torn island;

The U.N. undertook the first concerted global effort to examine the world economic situation and system, with the Sixth Special Session of the General Assembly producing both a new understanding of economic problems and a specific Charter on the Economic Rights and Duties of States;

The U.N. undertook the first concerted global examination of the earth's population growth, with the World Population Conference producing a detailed Plan of Action and serving as a focus and generator for public information and education in all countries;

The U.N. responded to the worldwide scarcity of food supplies, with respect to both the immediate crisis and to long-range planning and management, with the World Food Conference ending with the creation of new institutions and systems for food planning and distribution, and also serving as a vital focus for public awareness;

The U.N. continued its efforts to negotiate a revised law of the sea, including the creation of new international administrative and conservation institutions for the protection and best-exploitation of the living and mineral resources of the oceans . . . with a strong consensus reached on basic principles which now requires only translation into treaty language;

And the U.N. pursued development of the United Nations University as a source for worldwide cooperative research and problem-examination to resolve global challenges.

We of World Federalists, U.S.A. look to the United Nations and its related agencies as the channel for exploring and developing new institutions and more productive applications of existing institutions to cope with the Great Crises of our era. The role of the United States in creating an international response to the realities of interdependence is crucial. Our country, a continental storehouse of natural and human resources, has been the least severely affected by these crises, and thus has a special obligation and ability to offer leadership in developing new institutions and policies.

We therefore call upon the United States to:

(1) Re-assert the 1967 U.N. resolutions as the objectives of United States efforts in the Middle East; acknowledge that a lasting solution of the conflict requires the establishment of a new state on the West Bank which would respect the rights of its inhabitants and its neighbors; and seek the acceptance of representatives of the Palestine Liberation Organization as participants in the Geneva peace conference and any other negotiations.

(2) Reduce our wasteful expenditure for armaments, which increase the potential for nuclear and conventional confrontation; impose restrictions on our own indiscriminate trade in arms and military training and technology; and intensify our efforts—through both bi-lateral channels and multi-lateral collective security proposals under the auspices of the United Nations—to achieve mutual reductions in armaments leading eventually to universal nuclear and conventional disarmament.

(3) Lead in international efforts to respond to both the short-term and long-term aspects of the world food crisis, by making available immediately several million additional tons of grain for distribution through multi-lateral agencies, by compensating the hardest-hit nations for the disproportionate amount of capital resources which they have had to expend to purchase emergency food-stuffs at commercial rates, and by supporting the widest possible development of the role of the new World Food Council as a planning and administrative agency for technological assistance and reserve management.

(4) Recognize the right of each country to govern the exploitation of the natural resources within its jurisdiction, but promote negotiation between consumer and producer countries to arrive at agreements concerning equitable access and fair compensation.

(5) Seek the creation of a new United Nations Energy Administration to coordinate the research and development of new and expanded sources of energy, and to assist in assuring that the legitimate needs of all countries are fulfilled.

(6) Seek a new regime for the oceans which can protect both the living resources and the economic interests of all states in the exploitation of fisheries and minerals, and which will also provide for a direct revenue source for the financing of United Nations development programs. Most particularly, it is imperative that the Congress not undermine the current international efforts to negotiate an oceans treaty by passage of any legislation which would unilaterally extend United States jurisdiction or otherwise preempt the collective objectives of the Law of the Sea Conference.

(7) Seek the strengthening—through regulatory and enforcement powers—of existing international institutions which are attempting to protect the earth's ecosystem from the effects of insensitive and damaging national and private practices.

(8) Reassert and expand our commitment to economic and social development, which requires better terms of trade and a greater transfer of resources to the low-income countries; and specifically to seek a massive new internationally-administered program to alleviate the economic and social repression of the world's poor.

(9) Seek the establishment by the United Nations of basic conditions and standards to govern bi-lateral and multi-lateral assistance with respect to need, terms, form, administration, donor responsibilities and limits, recipient responsibilities and limits, etc. (It is an unfortunate circumstance of American aid that we have been the most manipulative and ostentatious, frequently resulting in the undermining of multi-lateral efforts and programs of other countries, and also frequently resulting in a net-counterproductivity of the aid program. I have been advocating the adoption of basic standards for nearly two decades now; I hope this simple measure is not far from realization.)

(10) Reassert a greater concern for human rights in the formulation of our national policies in bi-lateral and multi-lateral relations; join in supporting—and observing—concrete measures to advance the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; promote a greater consistency in the “proclamation” and combat of violations of human rights; and seek both an improved investigatory capacity and wider definitions of the role and authority of international legal machinery such as the World Court.

(11) Renew efforts to improve the capacity of the United Nations to respond to international armed conflict by assisting in the separation of hostile forces and in the implementation of organized approaches toward conflict resolution.

If the United States would offer leadership in these initiatives, I can assure you that the rest of the delegates at the United Nations would have little time—and even less interest—in pursuing the kind of activities which so disconcerted us during 1974.

I pledge to you the unrelenting support of World Federalists, U.S.A. in the pursuit of these objectives as basic tenets of the global policies of the United States. It is a campaign which we shall attempt to carry to all officers and agencies of Government, and to all elements of public society. Our commitment is to a better-managed world.

Congressman, if you would allow me two digressions:

First, Chairman Hamilton, I would like to mention to you that should you soon be giving further study to the situation in the Middle East, you may wish to call upon our Honorary President, Norman Cousins (editor of *Saturday Review*), who has just returned from New Delhi where he presided over the Quadrennial Congress of the World Association of World Federalists, from which he retired as President at the session. On his return trip, Norman Cousins stopped in the Middle East for a very interesting series of conversations with government officials, his associates in the public media, and also such political leaders as Yasir Arafat. I am sure he could offer you some valuable, up-to-date, insights on the situation.

And second, may I note that the Annual Report on the General Assembly by our World Federalist Representative at the United Nations, Donald F. Keys, will shortly be available through our World Federalist Educational Fund. This Report includes a review of all proceedings, commentary on the causes and implications of various actions, and our annual Voting Record of all states. We will be taking the liberty, Congressmen, of sending this very useful Report to all Members of Congress for their perusal. I am sure you will find it highly informative, authored by an experienced and recognized observer of the U.N. scene . . . Don Keys is often referred to as “the 139th Ambassador”!

A COMMENT ON UNESCO'S ACTIONS REGARDING ISRAEL

(By Luther H. Evans, Director General of UNESCO, 1953-58)

The General Conference of UNESCO, at its 18th Session (October-November 1974), voted on three amendments to a resolution defining the membership of the European Regional Grouping as including only member states whose principal territory was in Europe. The first amendment was to include the United States, which was accepted by teller vote; the second was to include Canada, which was also accepted; and the third was to include Israel, which resulted in a tie vote (30-30). A roll call vote was then taken, and the proposed amendment was lost. The impact of the vote is quite limited, since every member state has the right to be represented at any UNESCO meeting, at least in the role of observer.

The General Conference also considered the persistent violation by Israel of numerous resolutions and decisions of the General Conference and the Executive Board in earlier years regarding archaeological excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem. The General Conference in 1972, for instance, disapproved “of the continuation by Israel of archaeological excavations in Jerusalem,” and urgently called again upon Israel:

“(a) to take the necessary measures for the scrupulous preservation of all sites, buildings and other cultural properties, especially in the Old City of Jerusalem;

“(b) to desist from any alteration of the features of the City of Jerusalem;

“(c) to desist from any archaeological excavations, the transfer of cultural properties and any alterations of their features or their cultural and

historic character, particularly with regard to Christian and Islamic religious sites;

"(d) to adhere scrupulously to the provisions of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (The Hague, 1954) and of the above-mentioned resolutions."

In 1974, the Executive Board of UNESCO noted that Israel "persists in not complying with the relevant resolutions, and that its attitude prevents the Organization from undertaking the mission which is incumbent upon it under the terms of the Constitution." It further decided to submit the matter to the General Conference. The General Conference passed the resolution which has caused the adverse publicity. It contained no new idea except to disallow any funds to assist Israel in matters of cultural preservation, etc., until it is found to be in compliance with UNESCO's expectations. The amount for this purpose in the two years 1973-74 was \$24,000.

One might argue about the substance of UNESCO's efforts in this matter of cultural preservation, but one could hardly blame the vote of the General Conference on an Arab-inspired political campaign.

There was another resolution instructing the Director-General to supervise Israel's educational program for Arab children in Israeli schools which seems confused and inoperative, but which does reflect considerable hostility to some aspects of that country's educational policy. The merits of the complaint are unknown to me.

All I feel competent to recommend as to the United States attitude is that we should try to use our influence to resolve the conflicts here, and certainly the most important objective is the bringing of peace to the area. A general attack on UNESCO, or withholding cooperation in pursuit of most of its programs, or cutting off funds, would seem to be unjustified, and in the long run contrary to our own world objectives and national interests. One might as well close schools until adolescent gangs stop fighting, as a means of punishing them and teaching them better behavior.

MR. EVANS. Thank you.

MR. FRASER. Now, one of the comments I have seen that has emanated from some of the countries' spokesmen who take exception to our concern about what was happening in the General Assembly was to point to the U.S. position through the years in denying mainland China the Chinese seat in the United Nations. They point to that as a U.S. hypocrisy, a U.S. failure to honor, in effect, the realities of the situation and to suggest that we don't come into the debate with clean hands.

They have other illustrations as well, but that is one in particular which I recall was in the statements they made. I think it was made in the General Assembly. I wonder what the view of the witnesses might be on that version by other countries, that while we may complain about what has happened, there are, I assume they would say, equal complaints to be made by them about the U.S. positions in the past and our actions within the U.N. bodies.

AMBASSADOR SCALI. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take that question, if I may. I am not going to defend every decision that every past administration has made in the area of foreign policy.

As a newsman, when I had great wisdom, I happened to believe that the People's Republic of China deserved to be represented in the United Nations and that it was an error on the part of the United States to seek to prevent this.

However, if you recall, the Chinese themselves imposed a very important condition. It was not only that they should be admitted, but that simultaneously that the Government on Taiwan should be ejected. I am still not persuaded that the United Nations acted with all of the wisdom possible when it decided that in order to admit the Chinese Republic, it should eject the Government on Taiwan.

I believe it is a strong functioning Government and that at a minimum it deserved to represent the people on Taiwan. So there is something to be said for that argument. But I submit to you that we face the present and we look toward the future.

Mr. FRASER. Do either of the other witnesses want to comment on that?

Dr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. I think Ambassador Scali has made a good point. The position I took about 15 years ago was that there must be two Chinas in the U.N. because it seemed to me that the U.N. should recognize the fact of a prolonged realistic situation, and it seemed to me there are two Chinas and the U.N. ought to recognize the facts rather than try to spin out doctrines of sovereignty being undecided and that sort of thing. I agree with Ambassador Scali that it is too bad that the Assembly threw out the Republican Government of China.

I think it is just as fair to have two governments in China as it is to have two Germanys, which we have come around to. I think it would be fair to have two Koreas and two Vietnams in the U.N. without prejudice to the unification later of those countries.

I think we must recognize the situation as a fact, and I think that we should stand on the ground which Thomas Jefferson stood on—he laid down two principles for recognition of a government: One, that it was able to maintain itself or gave promise of being able to maintain itself; second, that it would agree to fulfill its international obligations.

We have departed from those principles in the past, beginning with Woodrow Wilson, who said he would not recognize a government that doesn't come into power by democratic methods. Well, we abandoned that a long time ago, and we have tried to introduce certain other criteria later on.

The United States took the position for a while that communist China should not be recognized because it fought a war against the United Nations. Well, that is a new principle. Germany and Italy and Japan could also be said to have fought a war against what called itself in those days the United Nations, after January 1, 1942, at any rate. And still they were welcomed back.

So I think that was a fallacious argument.

Ambassador SCALI. I would just like to make one additional comment, Mr. Chairman, and that is that in the present situation one must hope that as a result of the Shanghai communique of 1972 that we can proceed to normalize our relations with the People's Government in Peking, and that the People's Government in turn and the government on Taiwan can have the kind of friendly discussions that will eventually lead to a peaceful solution to this problem.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Morgenthau, you referred to the personnel hiring in the U.N. Secretariat and pointed to the inordinate number of Arab citizens who have been employed. In relation to the Third World, the Arab community of nations is still a fairly small proportion if one takes the entire Third World. Is there evidence that the fact that there may be an inordinate number of Arab citizens employed by the Secretariat has been a factor in any of the political decisions of either the General Assembly or any of the other U.N. bodies?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. It is very difficult to say what goes into the making of a decision of a collective body, but the coincidence of the two facts, of certain decisions of the General Assembly and of the one-sided staffing of the Secretariat, gives one food for thought. I mean there is no way of proving any proposition one way or the other. It is in the nature of things.

Mr. FRASER. Just as a follow-on question, is it likely—or maybe the Ambassador knows—that if one looked at the Third World in general as to whether they are overrepresented or underrepresented.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. The Third World is underrepresented.

Mr. FRASER. Underrepresented?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. Is underrepresented, I would say.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, may I say a word about an international secretariat, since I headed one for several years, that of UNESCO, and it operates under the same general principles as the Secretariat of the United Nations. That is, all the staff members are sworn to put the interests of the organization above that of their own nations.

Member states are asked not to try to influence members of the staff or to put pressure on them, some words of that kind. And I found in UNESCO—I have never been on the staff of the U.N., so I can't speak of that—it was easy to develop a genuinely international spirit in the staff if there was strong administration and if there was fair administration, and if people were trusted to talk to their governments without fear of reprisal.

When I first appointed a number of Soviet citizens to the staff, some of the employees came running to me and said:

Well, these chaps report all the time to the Soviet Embassy.

I said:

Well, I have seen a lot of the Americans go to the American Embassy and a lot of the Frenchmen talk to the Foreign Office and a lot of the British talk to their Foreign Office.

I said:

I like that. I think it is a wonderful thing for them to keep in touch with their governments because we don't have any secrets here, so what they will tell them will be in our favor more than against us.

and I welcomed this kind of relationship.

But on the question of loyalty to the organization as against their government, there was very little that I could discern that wasn't loyalty to the organization. Now, one of the great values, however, of geographical distribution is that all of us are bound by our cultural upbringing. This may not be a national thing. It may be a Western culture, advanced nation culture, a Moslem culture, or whatever it may be. So that from the standpoint of getting a good mixture of world attitudes in the Secretariat, it is very important to have geographical distribution, and I know that it is impossible to have it be completely fair.

We have got a lot of formulas for it. Some is number of bodies, some is a combination of bodies plus grades, how high one is in the hierarchy. I never was able to find anything that was entirely suitable. There are always problems of geographical distribution.

For instance, in my time in UNESCO the Indians and Pakistanis were more overrepresented than most any other country, but I didn't consider it a distortion of our program. And it doesn't necessarily result that there is a distortion in the number of the staff. I suppose the greatest distortion of the staff might be the pressure of so many Americans at the U.N., since so many of the clerks are Americans. The Americans are overstaffed in the United Nations, just as they were understaffed in UNESCO, and the French and British overstaffed.

I just want to make these few remarks. I don't think that the loyalty or competence of the staffs of these organizations is among their great problems.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to join in thanking our distinguished witnesses for their very valuable testimony and say if John Scali's degree of wisdom is typical of that of the fourth estate, we are in much better condition in this country than I thought we were in the quality of our reporting and editorial comment.

Ambassador SCALI. Mr. Congressman, if I may, I think it is.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Now, I think Professor Morgenthau in his very eloquent way, and our colleague Lester Wolff also, have succinctly pointed up some of the deficiencies of the U.N. organization and some of the reactions that I think are shared by a great many people in this country to those deficiencies.

Personally I don't really care whether a United Nations organization is good, bad, or indifferent. I am not sure what I think about that. I tend to agree with Winston Churchill about democracy being the worst form of government except for all the other kinds, and I am not certain that I think any government is particularly much more than a necessary evil.

There might be more peace, less war, more progress, and certainly less confusion if we just did away with all the governments there are, and the same may be true of the U.N. organization. There certainly are problems where the wealth and strength in the world are not adequately reflected in the way the voting is structured, for example. But regardless of the degree of purity or goodness or badness of the U.N. organization, I think the real point for American citizens is: do you believe that this is an instrument within which we can work to serve those purposes in the world and to reach for those goals in the world that we believe to be right, an instrument that is more valuable to have than not to have, and if this is the case, will our interests be served, for example, by cutting our budget contribution to the U.N. organization in response to that which we consider either wrong or downright out of step with the charter of the U.N.?

Ambassador SCALI. Well, Congressman Buchanan, first of all, thank you for your remarks. I am not sure I have an answer yet to what the considered Government position should be that we propose to the Congress on the steps that should follow since last December. The actions that were taken during the 29th Assembly were ones which, if not unprecedented and were at a minimum in some cases unconstitutional and did violate the charter—I spoke up on December 6 on behalf of our Government to say we regarded this as a very serious

matter and that it eroded the purpose and prestige of the charter and, indeed, the support of the American people who demand a sense of fairplay when we consider complicated problems.

We do not expect to win every battle, but we want to know what the rules are, and we wish to expect that the results be determined by who best carries out the rules and who has the most logic on his side. We have taken an action as a result of the wisdom of Congress in denying funds to UNESCO.

I recognize that this amounts to an illegal action and it is against international law, because we have accepted under the rules and the Founding Articles of UNESCO the obligation to meet all the assessments that are levied on us. But I am not going to sit here and tell you that you were wrong.

I think that the action that was taken despite some other interpretations, was at least partly a political reprisal against a member state. I fully recognize that there is a history involved in the UNESCO matter where Israel could with some justification be accused of looking after the monuments which were of importance to Jews and perhaps not sufficiently paying equal attention to the Moslem and Arab monuments.

Mr. EVANS. And Christian, Mr. Scali.

Ambassador SCALI. Well, if you will just permit me to finish that, I was going to get to that.

Mr. EVANS. Excuse me. I beg your pardon, sir.

Ambassador SCALI. We recognize that Jerusalem is of great importance to all three religions and that the Pope has spoken up about the need for increased Israeli attention to some of the shrines which are of importance to the Catholic religion. But I am not sure that at this particular time that the action that was taken did not reflect a degree of vindictiveness against Israel for the October war, nor do I believe that the action that was taken will necessarily lead to the kind of remedial action which I and others would like to see.

And so I say that, of course, the U.S. Government will seek in keeping with the action of Congress to persuade the Executive Board to resolve this matter in friendly conversations with the Government of Israel, and I would hope that we can go on from that point, because I do believe that UNESCO continues to perform an important international purpose, and I am also very much alarmed at the alienation of much of the intellectual community in the Western World, and indeed many of the opinionmakers, this kind of action in this kind of a setting because I do not believe that any agency in the United Nations family should be made a tool of political reprisal.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think where I have problems is in deciding when by our actions we are actually helping to effectively combat unacceptable acts within the U.N. or when we are simply taking actions that, in the long run, are against our own interests. I would again ask, do you feel that we should cut our share to the U.N. budget, that we cut our funding?

There will be substantial pressure, I assume, in the Congress for that to be done, or there may be. I am really interested even in the present context if that appears to be something that is going to serve our national interest.

Ambassador SCALI. Let me make clear I am not proposing, advocating, or indicating in any way that we should give less to the U.N. system and its family of agencies than we have in the past. Let's go with this as starters.

I strongly suspect, however, that we may be getting some advice on this from Members of the Congress, and I will tell you, as I say now, that we are legally committed under international law in most of the United Nations agencies of which we are a member, to provide the 25 percent which all countries believe should be our maximum share, and I would think that in areas such as the United Nations development program, for example, that there is ample reason for increasing our assistance.

I also think that it would be wise and indeed perhaps indispensable to increase the amount to be set aside for UNRRA, the agency which looks after the Arab refugees in many camps of the Middle East, so I want my position to be clearly understood.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Does any other witness want to comment on Mr. Buchanan's questions?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. I might comment on two points: First, the point of contributions. I would advocate that the United States fulfill its legal obligations, but do nothing beyond them. The kind of generosity we have shown in the past, I think, would lend itself now to misinterpretation if we were to continue it.

You should do what you are legally required to, but no more. As far as the action of the UNESCO is concerned, I have in front of me excerpts from the reports of the highly qualified archeologists who were sent to Israel to report to the Secretary General of UNESCO and who came back with reports most flattering to the Israeli Government, and the Secretary General of UNESCO has supported in an article in *Le Monde* last November those reports after he had left office. So there is very little, if any, evidence that there is any factual basis for the actions which UNESCO has taken.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I am not qualified to know whether the excavations Israel has made are in substance right or wrong. The only thing that I was trying to indicate was that Israel had refused to accept the views of the UNESCO General Conference, its Executive Board, and its Director General as to the legality, of what they were doing. That was the only point. Under the conference at The Hague in 1954 and the Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in Time of Armed Conflict, no country may excavate for archeological purposes in an occupied territory. The merits are irrelevant.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think the kind of question that disturbs me is simply this. Our obligation isn't due until July of 1975, but if we haven't paid it by April 30, 1976, we lose our vote, and then we can't represent our interest or anybody's interest. Without in any way feeling anything other than the strongest disapproval of the action taken by UNESCO, I wonder whether this is the most productive response for our country.

Ambassador SCALI. Mr. Congressman, if I may, you bring up a most important point, because Israel has not proposed in any way to cease or end its contributions to UNESCO. The United States, as I under-

stand it, would be the only one which would indicate a desire to do so. I would favor a full and active and continuing membership in UNESCO so that as part of the 40-man Executive Board and with the leadership of the new Director, Mike Amphiol, we can work out a reasonable compromise on this. There is to be a meeting of the Executive Board, if I recall correctly, on May 5 in Nairobi, and hopefully this matter can be considered anew at this high level.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wonder about the exclusion of Israel from the regional group. I wonder if you would comment on that.

Ambassador SCALL. I find this decision that was taken by the Executive Board, which to me is of the most questionable legality because in the past, even though it has been difficult to become a member of a regional group because it, in turn, depends on the membership, that I find myself more deeply disturbed by this. There are no set guidelines for determination of the composition of regional groups. Normally, the determination is essentially geographic and rests with the other members of the geographic area concerned.

This is the practice in the U.N. itself. For example, Cuba has normally occupied Latin American seats, but in recent years when it could not get Latin American endorsement, it has on at least one occasion occupied an East European seat with the consent of the East Europeans.

Another example is Turkey. When this was enlarged in 1957, one of the regions specified was "Western European and Other." The "Other," with the agreement of the West Europeans, was to cover states either not following naturally into or not acceptable to any other regional group. Included in the first category were Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and in the second, South Africa and Israel. However, Israel has never wished to be considered a Western European in that sense and has not participated in that group in the United Nations itself, preferring to be accepted as a Middle Eastern or Asian, but so far unable to achieve this.

The history of the Western European group is, however, not necessarily relevant to UNESCO. For example, UNESCO has a European group both including Western Europeans and Eastern Europeans unlike any other body. It rests with UNESCO to determine its own policies with respect to regional groupings. However, on the key vote that we are talking about here, if I recall correctly, the General Conference on 21 November denied an Israeli motion to include Israel in UNESCO's European regional group, 38 yes, which included the United States, 44 no, and 33 abstaining with 31 absent.

And UNESCO has recently emphasized regional conferences of all other member states not in the regional group, that is, the United States and Canada were each for the first time included in the European regional group. That is an overly long explanation and it is very complicated, but I find this the kind of action that is the kind that I would more deplore than the other where I believe that there can be some kind of case made for whether Israel did or did not do all it could to protect the religious monuments.

Mr. FRASER. Do any other witnesses have a comment on that question?

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, just a legal point of minor character. Although Israel is not a member of the regional group according to

this vote of UNESCO—and there is some question whether Europeans couldn't go ahead and ask them to join their regional group. I haven't looked into the legality of that—every member state has the right to send a representative to any UNESCO meeting and if they aren't a full participant, they can be represented by an observer. I will give you an example.

I want to emphasize the point that Israel can still attend any UNESCO meeting, whether it is in the region or not. And the United States has frequently done that. I represented the United States at a meeting of African national commissions in Uganda on one occasion. I wasn't a regular participant, neither was the Soviet representative who sat by me, but we were there as observers and we were asked toward the end to make a few remarks.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Morgenthau.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. I don't think I have anything else.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Bonker.

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Ambassador, of course, any world legislative body by its scope and complexity will have its share of problems, and in my short 4 weeks in the Congress I have received a great deal of mail about the United Nations, most of which urges that we leave the United Nations. But I am concerned that in your December 6 statement and your testimony today, which is shared by others on the panel, that referred to by Mr. Morgenthau as the moral perversion and degeneration of the United Nations, that we are reaching a point where we must seriously analyze whether or not we should stay in the United Nations. In fact, Mr. Morgenthau said that the United States ought to consider seriously the withdrawal of its support from the United Nations if these reforms aren't adopted or if they fail.

I would like to know, No. 1 do you share that view? Do you feel that the matter is so serious that the United States should consider withdrawing from the United Nations; and, No. 2, is the United States developing a program of very specific steps that we could take to make it more palatable for the United States to stay in?

Now we have just gone through basic reforms in the Congress that would have appeared impossible a few months ago, and I am not suggesting that we reform the United Nations, but I am wondering if there is a realm of possibility to make it more responsive to the United States.

Ambassador SCALL. Mr. Congressman, thank you.

I am aware of the kind of mail that you are receiving, too, and I find it somewhat uncomfortable to be embraced by those who say, let us pull out of the United Nations, because that has never been my position, is not my position now, nor will it be in the future.

In my December 6 speech I said very firmly and very clearly, I thought, that I am not proposing that the United States turn its back on the United Nations because we have lost a series of battles. I said in my Boston speech, reversing the current trend toward division and confrontation in the United Nations does not depend on our efforts alone, however. I am convinced that we must walk the extra mile to overcome suspicion.

We are not the guardians of the status quo. We are proud of our heritage as a revolutionary country which seeks to promote freedom.

Some may question whether the flame of liberty burns as bright as we approach our 200th birthday. We must demonstrate by our actions that it does, that we remain dedicated not only to freedom, equality and human dignity, but to a more just world.

I have pledged the United States to promote this new spirit of constructive compromise in the United Nations, but others must join us if we are to succeed. I hope that answers your question.

Mr. BONKER. Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Gilman.

I hope the witnesses will respond to any questions whether directed to them or not.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. If I may say a word, I agree with the Ambassador as far as the present is concerned. I would not commit myself, if I had to make any decision, for the future. I could visualize a situation in which I would regard it to be against the interests of the United States on moral grounds to continue support of, or even membership in, the United Nations.

I would also say there is a difference between support and membership. You can separate yourself, you can play an inactive role and remain a member, and you can forego membership altogether. As far as the future is concerned, I would keep the threat of American disengagement from the United Nations over the heads of the leaders of the new majority and would expect a beneficial result from such a political action.

Ambassador SCALI. If I could just add something to that, Mr. Morgenthau. I believe that it must be understood by all members of the United Nations that when I spoke out on behalf of our Government on December 6 that I was not making any threats to withdraw, but that I was expressing a profound sense of disillusion at some of the extra-legal, unprecedented, and illegal actions that had been taken and it was meant as a friendly warning that we would hope that the excesses that we had witnessed in the 29th session would not be repeated because if they were, in any reassessment the record of the United Nations after these words had been said, would have to be taken into account, and indeed I would expect that Congress perhaps would be very strongly advising us in what direction to move.

Mr. BONKER. Do you anticipate that the 30th session will be similar to the 29th?

Ambassador SCALI. Congressman Bonker, I can't tell you. I have in the past several weeks expressed a complete readiness to begin the kind of intensive discussions which I would hope would precede compromise, accommodation, and conciliation. It now depends on whether the modern and responsible leaders of the Third World recognize this as a sincere invitation to engage in this kind of dialog.

I am hopeful that some are beginning to recognize this and that they understand that the United States is prepared to come to the table with a desire to find the kind of solution that all can accept, but the answer to that will not be known for several months yet.

We have a special session of the Assembly which is to begin about September 1, one which will again be chaired by President Bouteflika in advance of the regular Assembly session, which will begin about

September 21, so there is much work ahead of us in the way of consultation.

These will be confidential and I hope conducted in a spirit of compromise, but I can't forecast right now where we are going to go except that I do detect an improving spirit and increasing readiness, I think, to discuss responsible as against doctrinaire solutions.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that from much more fragmentary evidence than Ambassador Scali has, I think that he is correct in his analysis, that there is a disposition to mellow a bit. I was talking with one African chief delegate a few weeks ago at a private party and he said they had gone too far and that they were going to take, as far as his group of countries are concerned, a more moderate stance in the future.

Now one swallow doesn't make a summer, but the delegate's remarks point in the same direction, and I think he spoke for several west African countries.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, I want to join my colleagues in welcoming you here and thank you for your expression of opinion, particularly I would like to add my compliments to the many that you received, Ambassador Scali, for your succinct statement before the United Nations, which I think reflected not only your thinking but the thinking of the American public, and I know it certainly reflected the thinking in my own region where, if I were to take a vote today, there would be, instead of the usual minority interested in criticizing the U.N. as in days gone by, there would be a strong majority seeking our Nation's removal from the United Nations.

You have talked of the tyranny of the majority and you note that we have been a host country and have been a substantial financial contributor and an active participant. You have aroused a great amount of debate in the U.N. and hopefully have aroused it to such an extent that they took a good inward look.

Do you see some hope for reform? Do you see any movement toward reform? Not just a hope for reform, but do you see some actual reform with regard to structure and voting and their manner of consideration of some of the major issues that are before the United Nations?

Ambassador SCALI. Mr. Congressman, thank you very much for your comments. I am hoping more for a change in attitude than I am for reform in the actual rules and/or charter of the organization. One of the resolutions that was passed by the current Assembly was to appoint a 42-nation ad hoc committee to consider changes in the structure of the United Nations.

As you undoubtedly know, the United States and Britain, France and, believe it or not, the Soviet Union, are all on the same side on this. They believe that the current charter is a pretty good one and that particularly as it delineates the powers of the Security Council with the right of the permanent members to veto. The question, I think, basically before the House then would be whether within the existing rules we might not find opportunities to streamline some of the existing procedures.

For example, let's ask the question: Is it necessary for every independent specialized agency to exist as a separate entity now, almost 29 years after the United Nations was formed? Can there be a merger of some of the activities? Can, for example, the new proposed United Nations University take over some of the training and educational functions that are now being performed by some other agencies, indeed, by many agencies with the result that there has been overlapping?

But the answers to this, I think, are going to come very slow because it is mostly the view of the nonaligned and the Third World countries that the veto is obsolete and outdated and that if we wish to reflect the real world as it now exists with at least 138 members, perhaps the Security Council should be enlarged from 15 to 26, whatever it is, with some other countries, including some of the Third World countries also being given veto rights.

As I indicated we take a pretty dim view of any changes of the Security Council structure, but perhaps as we discuss this and as we seek to provide a new spirit of compromise that we can find ways within the existing structure to make improvements. And I might add one other point, and as the Middle East crisis hopefully subsides, with God, good luck, and skillful diplomacy all playing a role, and we move on to the next stage and the Middle East ceases to be such a highly inflammatory area, and as the economic earthquake caused by the sharply increased oil prices becomes more manageable, perhaps within this special environment in the United Nations there can also be a mellowing of language and a readiness to believe that we are all facing the same problems and what we are seeking are compromises acceptable to all.

Mr. GILMAN. Professor Morgenthau, do you see any need for a structural change?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. No, I don't see any, especially as the increase in the membership of the Security Council, I think, would be a calamity. The League of Nations followed that path and it was one of the reasons for its downfall because once you have a Security Council composed of 20 or 25 members, it is no longer manageable, and the veto is, of course, the protection of the vital interests of the great powers or the so-called great powers and is not going to be abolished.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Evans.

Mr. EVANS. I think there is a way to change the Security Council slightly without increasing its membership, and that is to develop the principle that, say, Japan, Brazil, Nigeria or India might be elected repetitively among the elected group but not be among the permanent members with the veto. Now Mr. Rogers, as Secretary of State, in making a speech to the General Assembly, once noted that it was too bad Japan was not a permanent member of the Security Council. Some of us have studied that and think that something along this line could be done without amending the charter. You just change the rules somewhat.

I believe it can be done by changing the rules and not force such a state off after one election, but maybe elect it twice and then maybe rotate it off. My organization of World Federalists believes that eventually we ought to deal with the problem of reflecting power

that Professor Morgenthau has mentioned so well by having in addition to one state, one vote, a second body comparable to the General Assembly but with only advisory powers to begin with, that would be more reflective of population, but with certain limits on maximum representation, and certain minimums on population, so that you would get something closer to a population body.

You would still want to keep the body small, maybe 300 members or 600 members or something of that kind. And let it be a subsidiary body to the General Assembly, not with as much power, but get a reflection of opinion based on population rather than on individual states. The situation would be parallel to the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives. One is on a one-state/two-vote basis and the House is on a population basis, but I don't see the organ of the U.N. sharing power the way they do in our Government.

Ambassador SCALL. Mr. Gilman, I just wanted to add—and Dr. Evans jogged my memory on this—that the United States has come out publicly in favor of adding Japan to the Security Council and continues to hold that position. My comments were directed mainly at the difficulty that would be involved once we open the whole question of adding, for example, even one member which we want, namely, Japan, and the almost interminable hassle that would ensue as we sought to come up with a new W.A. membership that would be better reflective of the power realities of the world today.

So I was just expressing a rather skeptical view about the ability, during this go-round at least, to come up with either a Security Council structure that would be substantially different than what we have had.

Mr. EVANS. I really wouldn't argue very strongly on that. It is a difficult problem, and it needs some very careful weighing before a decision is made.

Mr. GILMAN. Gentlemen, first we witnessed Arafat's appearance at the U.N. and then we heard the UNESCO decision ousting Israel and now we are reading some comments about the possibility of unseating Israel in the U.N., do you see that as a very real threat?

Mr. EVANS. It has never even occurred to me.

Ambassador SCALL. I have heard of no such move. I doubt that the Arab countries would be so extreme as to seek to expel Israel. I would like to point out that it is highly unlikely that Israel would be expelled from the United Nations as long as the United States has a veto.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. I would agree with that. I have no judgment as to the likelihood, but I am certain under the present conditions that the move could not succeed so long as the United States is a member of the Security Council with the right of veto.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Evans, would you care to comment?

Mr. EVANS. I never thought of the issue. I think, in thinking of it, that there is just no possibility of this, even aside from the veto. I don't think the Russians would want to do it even.

Ambassador SCALL. Excuse me. Could I make one additional comment? As you know, there was a move to expel South Africa and it was stopped by the triple veto of the United States, Britain and—

Mr. EVANS. France, wasn't it?

Ambassador SCALI. It was France. All three of us expressed our very stern opposition to apartheid and hoped South Africa could change, but as a constitutional matter we felt it would be easier to exert influence on South Africa so long as we kept it in the United Nations and held its feet to the fire of what international public opinion was like.

Then as you know, there was a move taken to bar South Africa from participation in the current Assembly and this had carried by an overwhelming vote. We believe that this was an intralegal action and, of course, voted against it, but the point was South Africa was barred from the Assembly, so the graver danger might be that a group of countries might seek to bar Israel from participation in a session of the General Assembly.

I would think it highly likely that the United States would oppose this with all of its diplomatic resources and that in view of the worldwide furor that was caused even by the ejection of South Africa from the current Assembly that this would not be a device that would necessarily commend itself.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Bingham.

Mr. BINGHAM. Just on that point, I might say if that were to occur, I think there would be nothing more calculated to bring down the United Nations and to give encouragement to those who were calling for the United States to withdraw from it.

Ambassador SCALI. I would like to join in commending you for your statement of December 6 and to say that I agree with practically everything that you have said here today. I think it might be worth noting that while others have agreed with what you said on December 6, it is also important to note that you made a number of comments about positive aspects of the United Nations in your testimony today, and I think those are also to be noted.

On the matter of voting in the General Assembly, it seems to me it might be useful to get a little clarification on that point. I notice that my colleague, Congressman Wolff, said:

Because each nation is given one vote, a two-thirds majority can be obtained from nations representing a scant 10 percent of the total population represented in the U.N. By virtue of this, the General Assembly has passed measures that do not conform to the realities of the world situation.

Isn't it true, Ambassador SCALI, that the majority which was so painful to us on many occasions was probably in proportion to population or perhaps even larger because it included India, Pakistan, China, the Soviet Union, and all of those states?

Ambassador SCALI. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. So it is wrong to suggest, as did Dr. Morgenthau, that the mini-state problem is the same thing as the problem of the majority in the General Assembly. It is the fact that these huge countries with the large populations are with the small states. Isn't that so?

Ambassador SCALI. Yes, sir, that is true. In almost all of the cases in the past Assembly the resolution that we opposed and which we tried so strenuously to block did represent a majority of the people and the fact that you do have a vast majority representing less than 10 percent of the population doesn't necessarily mean automatically whatever decision they come up with will be one of the objectives, although unhappily it seems to work out quite often.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was rather perturbed by Dr. Morgenthau's remarks about the overrepresentation in the Secretariat of these Arab states. Would you comment on that, Ambassador Scali, on page 5 of Dr. Morgenthau's statement?

Ambassador SCALI. Yes; I am familiar with the recent report that was made on that which alleged that the Secretary General was subject to enormous pressure and that he usually gave in to the views most effectively propounded. I am not so much concerned about the number of Arab nationals who are members of the National Secretariat. We have to remember that the United Nations is 29 years old.

The principle of geographic distribution is becoming more and more recognized, but it has not been enshrined as a precept to be followed at all times and that early in its formation mostly Western Europeans were in the leading roles, and so I think it inevitably and completely natural that representatives of other regions now seek to have some of their figures moved into the Secretariat.

As a matter of fact some of the Lebanese, for example, that he mentioned are men that I know who are remarkably objective and I think this also applies to some of the other Arab members. So a man's nationality does not necessarily reflect how objective and/or how competent he can be.

It has been said that the United States perhaps is overrepresented. Perhaps that was true—I am sure that was true in Dr. Evans' day. As a man who has recently consulted the statistics, Doctor, I can assure you it is not true now. As a matter of fact, that is one of my unending tasks, it seems, to go to the Secretary General and/or an Under Secretary or two, and to remind him that there is a highly qualified American who should be considered for *x*, *y*, and *z* post and sometimes I am successful and sometimes I am not and, as a matter of fact, I am pleased to see that there are more members of the Third World, Latin America, and Asia that now can fit within the Secretariat on their own qualifications.

Mr. BINGHAM. Congressman Wolff also referred to the fact—and I don't know whether his figure is correct—that the OPEC nations only pay a combined total of 1.28 percent of the budget. Do you anticipate that this year according to the standards that that are usually applied that some of the oil-producing nations will pay a substantially larger proportion of the U.N. budget?

Ambassador SCALI. I am not familiar, and perhaps I should be, with Congressman Wolff's figure. It sounds about right. I will just say as a principle that I think that the newly wealthy countries at a time when they have added \$65 billion to their treasuries in 1974 by selling the same quantity of oil that they did in 1973, should very seriously consider increasing the amount of resources that they make available to the United Nations system.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, might I add a point to that? The committee on contributions, which fixes the percentage each country shall pay to the budget, makes that assessment every 3 years. Now my memory is that they made a new assessment at the time that we reduced from some percentage or other down to 25 percent about 2 years ago. So I imagine in about a year they are going to work out a new allocation scheme, and they will automatically take into account

the gross national product of all member countries, and these changes will undoubtedly be reflected.

Mr. BINGHAM. Wouldn't it be in order for the Secretary General, as he normally does, to appeal this year to nations to make voluntary contributions to help with the very severe budgetary deficit that the United Nations suffers?

Ambassador SCALL. Congressman Bingham, I would be very happy to relay your suggestion to the Secretary General.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would hope with your endorsement.

Ambassador SCALL. I would think that there would be no reason why the OPEC countries should wait for an assessment conference to increase their voluntary contributions.

Mr. EVANS. May I add, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary General has made very strong appeals to them to help out with financial contributions in regard to the food problem and I think they have made some significant contributions, but I am not familiar with the exact figures.

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman would yield, I think I heard one of the World Bank economists say that the OPEC countries had to have 2 percent of the world's GNP and as a result of the world's higher prices are now getting 4 percent. That indicates the order of magnitude involved.

Mr. BINGHAM. One final question: Do any of you see any prospect of moving toward weighted voting in the General Assembly?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. I don't see any possibility. I mean this question has been examined very thoroughly by academics for 25 years and it is just not possible, because whatever qualifier you use, it is going to disadvantage certain countries drastically, which are not going to agree to it.

If you take the population standard, that would mean that India and China would have an overwhelming vote in international organizations, which other nations, certainly the Soviet Union, wouldn't accept. If you take the gross national product, it would lead to an overwhelming preponderance of the highly industrialized nations at the expense of the so-called Third World. There is simply no universally acceptable standard by which you can establish weighted voting.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, might I add though that there is another alternative which is being used to some extent and that is weighting the representation from groups of countries. Now we are all familiar with the fact that there is a law of the sea conference that was held in Caracas and will meet again the end of March in Geneva to try to finish its work, and one of its projects is to set up an authority within the structure of the United Nations to regulate the exploitation particularly of the deep seabed minerals and to some extent regulate other matters relating to the use of the seas.

It has been proposed that the representation with each country one vote should be rigged so as to reflect the interests of the fishing nations, the interests of the industrial nations who are able to exploit seabed minerals, the interests of the land-locked countries, and perhaps other groups of states, so that the voting there would be in proportion to the grouping of states with each state, as I say, having one vote.

So this kind of thing is being considered. And there is weighted voting in the Bank and the Fund, but as Dr. Morgenthau says, I don't think that principle of weighted voting with one country given more weight in voting than another is feasible for the General Assembly. It might be feasible for some of these subagencies, but the weighting of the groups of states, the middle states, the poor states, the landlocked states, the coastal states, the great industrial powers could be—even the League of Nations had some bodies, at least one body which took account of the 10 highest industrialized nations way back in those days in the makeup of some of their activities.

So I think this is worth exploring.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Lagomarsino.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Scali, back for a moment to the support of the United Nations and its suborganizations, how are the contributions computed? What factors are taken into consideration?

Ambassador SCALI. Well, this begins with the fact that in 1972 after a long campaign the United States succeeded in getting its percentage reduced from the average of 31.5 to a statutory 25 percent which, as a matter of fact, Congress mandated and made it very clear that it would not provide more than 24. The contribution of each member country is based on its ability to pay. In other words, on its relative national wealth, national income or per capita income times population.

The U.S. gross national product currently represents approximately one-third of the entire world's wealth. Thus were the United Nations to apply its normal criteria to the United States, we would be expected to pay something over 30 percent of the United Nations' regular budget in 1972. However, the United States succeeded in having the U.N. adopt a resolution reflecting maximum assessment which can be charged to any member, let alone the United States, to 25 percent and this had the effect of reducing our contribution.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. What is the contribution rate of the Soviet Union?

Ambassador SCALI. I think it is about 11 percent, isn't it?

Mr. EVANS. I think 12, but I am not sure.

Ambassador SCALI. Well, roughly 11 percent.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. And are they paid up at the present time?

Ambassador SCALI. Well, they are delinquent on assessments which they claim represented, in effect, voluntary contributions to operations of the kind that they did not believe in, such as some of the peacekeeping forces. I think they are something like \$180 million behind, but let's leave that figure open. They are substantially behind in assessments which they have declined to pay because of an objection to them in principle. Some of the Western countries are, too, for example.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. What happens in a case like that? Do we just forget about it?

Ambassador SCALI. No. We keep sending them bills.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Do we charge interest?

Ambassador SCALI. We keep reminding them and there is actually on the books a regulation by which if you are in arrearage for a number of years, that your vote can be taken away from you. However, the United Nations has never found it in its heart to do this.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Dr. Morgenthau, in your statement—and Congressman Bonker referred to this also—you say,

The United States ought to consider seriously the withdrawal of its support from the United Nations only after its reform through the use of American power and influence has definitely failed.

Would you care to comment on what you had in mind with regard to what power and influence we should use and in what way?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. Well, of course, I cannot give you an exact prescription about how American power and influence in the United Nations ought to be used. I only wanted to point to the fact that we are not helpless in the face of what has happened recently in the United Nations and that we ought to exhaust our resources to change the situation before we resort to more radical methods.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Ambassador Scali, what are the views of the United States in regard to the continued mandate of peacekeeping forces in the Middle East? I understand that mandate is about to expire. Do you expect it will be renewed? I guess you have to divide the question with regard to the Egypt-Israeli border and the Syrian-Israeli border.

Ambassador SCALI. To separate the combatants on both the Syrian and Egyptian fronts represented one of the important achievements of one of the United Nations' actions within a matter of weeks after the fighting stopped in 1973. The mandate, which goes on for 6 months, has been extended twice. It is due to be reconsidered by the Security Council at the end of April.

The first to be studied will be that of the Egyptian front, and then the Syrian front. We have every intention of seeking a renewal of that mandate because no matter how successful or skillful Dr. Kissinger is—and we all wish him well in his personal step-by-step diplomacy—there will be continuing need, we believe, for peacekeeping forces the Middle East until there is a lessening of the tension and the kind of agreement that both sides can have confidence in.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Do you expect the Security Council will go along with the extension?

Ambassador SCALI. I suspect that the amount of debate and the difficulty we have will be directly related to the amount of progress that has been made in achieving this next stage of the problem, withdrawal.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Is the Soviet Union and its Eastern—well, I guess we don't know yet what their position is going to be, but do you have any idea of what their attitude might be at this point?

Ambassador SCALI. In the past the Soviet position has remarkably paralleled that of the Arab governments.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Remarkably?

Ambassador SCALI. Yes.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I have no further questions.

Mr. FRASER. Dr. Morgenthau, I would just like to pursue one point and then we will close the hearing.

You stated that the United States should honor its legal obligations with respect to the assessment, dues or payments under the U.N. Charter, but that is all that we should do. I understand from what you say then that you believe we either should reduce or eliminate

our voluntary contributions, but I want to see just how far you would propose that that should be done.

Would that be for UNESCO or for the whole family of voluntary activities?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. I would take a very close and critical look at our voluntary contributions and would reduce those where the reduction would have a direct political effect, where it would be a kind of visible demonstration of our dissatisfaction with the actions of UNESCO. I would regard this as a political weapon which has to be chosen on political grounds.

Mr. FRASER. But your recommendation would run to the voluntary add-ons to the UNESCO budget. You are not thinking of the development program?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. No, I would certainly not think of humanitarian programs which have a justification all by themselves. I mean I would not play politics with food or with development funds.

Ambassador SCALI. If I may add to that, I recognize the principle that Dr. Morgenthau is suggesting. I think it is one that should be considered, Dr. Morgenthau, but I suspect that we would find on close study that most of the voluntary programs are humanitarian programs. For example, the UNDP, the United Nations development programs, where last year we appropriated \$90 million; UNICEF, where we gave \$15 million and where Congress in its wisdom decided to give \$18 million because it is a fine agency and it works very well. There is IAEA, which is voluntary. That is \$2 million.

There is UNRRA, where we gave \$14 million, and so it was a sub-total of \$125 million, and then in addition to that, there were another \$31 million as, for example—\$16 million for UNFACIP.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. I was trying to state a general principle. Obviously I am not qualified to go into the details and say here we can cut off \$1 million, here \$2 million.

Ambassador SCALI. No, but I understand the principle that Dr. Morgenthau is propounding here. I think it is one that is of a kind that should be studied because I believe that after having said what we did on December 6th, we must make it clear that we mean what we say.

Mr. FRASER. I invite any of the witnesses to make any last comment which they may feel would round out their testimony.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to round out the testimony except to say that in the World Federalists, which is interested in strengthening international institutions and supporting the rule of law and helping solve conflict situations, we have had a good deal of hope for the success of the policies or a good many of the policies that Secretary Kissinger has been following recently. I think we ought to applaud the general stance that Ambassador Scali has outlined today in dealing with the United Nations and UNESCO problems; and on the confrontation with the oil-exporting countries I think a lot is to be said for Dr. Kissinger's insistence on a step by which, first of all, the consuming countries would consider their position and then go into a general conference with the exporting countries and try to come to some agreements that won't jeopardize industrial civilization and won't pull down the structures that eventually the exporting countries will have to have in order for them to have a good life.

I think the moderate way in which he is approaching this matter deserves our public applause. I am not qualified to go into some of the questions about Turkey and Cyprus and some of these points, but this general overall policy of détente with the Soviet Union and increasing relations with mainland China while maintaining our relations with Taiwan, that sort of thing, I think, deserves support and applause.

Ambassador SCALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps I would like to close by just recalling the words that the British Ambassador, Mr. Richards, said at the annual meeting of the Pilgrims of the United States in New York on January 22. He summed it up:

Our task is to show that the interest of the developed and the developing are complementary, not antagonistic. All must understand the realities which limit the possibilities for action and all must make a deliberate attempt to find the common interest and to act on it to a point where all can see that they gain as well as give.

And to that, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add my personal view and my profound belief that it is not the radical extremists of either of the left or of the right that will draw the blueprint for tomorrow's more just world.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. FRASER. I want to thank all of the witnesses. We have been presented with an enormous amount of wisdom and insight. We really appreciate it and you have been very helpful to the subcommittee.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, sir.

Mr. MORGANTHAU. Thank you, sir.

Ambassador SCALL. Thank you, sir.

[Whereupon, at 4:30 p.m. the subcommittee adjourned, to reconvene at 2 p.m. of the following day, Wednesday, February 5, 1975.]

REVIEW OF THE 1974 GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE UNITED STATES POSITION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1975

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 2:10 p.m. in room 2255, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Donald M. Fraser (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. FRASER. The subcommittee will come to order.

This afternoon we continue the second of our hearings which consist of a review of the 1974 General Assembly and the U.S. position in the United Nations.

Yesterday we heard from Congressman Lester Wolff, Representative from New York; Hon. John Scali, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations; Prof. Hans Morgenthau of the New School of Social Research in New York; and Mr. Luther Evans, president, World Federalists, U.S.A.

This afternoon we are honored with three distinguished witnesses whose knowledge and understanding about the United Nations and some of the specialized agencies is unmatched.

Ambassador Charles W. Yost, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations will be our first witness, followed by Hon. James Leonard, president of the United Nations Association of the U.S.A. and formerly with the State Department, and someone I first met who was heading our delegation at the arms control talks in Geneva.

The third witness is Rosemary Ginn, chairman, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

We are delighted to have you here.

Ambassador Yost, why don't you proceed, sir.

STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES W. YOST, FORMER U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Yost. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I don't have a new written statement to submit. I have already, I believe, placed in the record my article in the *New Republic*¹ recently which dealt with the events in the General Assembly that have caused criticism.

¹ See appendix, p. 89.

I would like also to put in the record, if you will be so good, another article which I wrote a little earlier which appeared about the first of the year in the *Saturday Review*, called "The United Nations Was Never More Real Than Today," I have made copies available to the staff.

Mr. FRASER. Without objection, we will include that in the record.²

Mr. YOST. Then I would like to make simply a brief oral statement which strikes some of the principal notes in those articles, and then be open to questions.

The first point that I would like to make is that I think all of us tend to personalize the United Nations a little carelessly. One sees in the press that the U.N. has done this or that or the U.N. has failed to do this or that.

We are all aware that the U.N. is not a supergovernment. It is merely a very loose association of sovereign states, so what that really means is that a number of states in this, that, or the other body of the U.N. have expressed this or that view. If the U.N. didn't exist, presumably those states would have the same view and would behave in the same way, though it might not be as dramatically registered on our front pages because they wouldn't have cast votes in the U.N., I think it is important to recall that this is the fact.

The second point I would like to make is that most of the criticism which we have heard in the last few weeks has arisen from the action, votes, in the General Assembly, I am sure the subcommittee is aware, but I would like to remind everyone that the General Assembly, except in very limited budgetary and administrative matters, has no binding powers. It is merely a recommendatory body and all of its resolutions merely recommended.

It is, however, a useful sounding board because it enables us among others to know how the rest of the world is feeling and it does, as I said a moment ago, dramatize the views of great numbers of governments and people around the world in a way that would not otherwise take place.

Adlai Stevenson used to say that what the United States needs most is a hearing aid, and in a way the General Assembly is a useful hearing aid because it brings to our attention what others are thinking.

But the real work of the U.N. is done, as you are certainly aware, in other organs. Responsibilities of the U.N. for the maintenance of peace and security which are limited but significant, are performed by the Security Council where we have a veto. Eighty-five percent, roughly, of the budget, the total budget of the U.N. and its whole family of agencies, goes for the economic and social matters which are handled by a whole series of agencies like the Monetary Fund, the International Bank, the World Health Organization, Food and Agricultural Organization, the Development Program, the Environmental Program, the Population Program and so on.

And finally, work is done by the Secretary General largely through quiet diplomacy behind the scenes which we rarely hear much about.

So the reality of the U.N.—and in this respect the U.N. is like the proverbial iceberg, most of it is under the surface and the real work is done largely under the surface. These above-water manifestations

² See appendix, p. 92.

that have attracted so much attention are significant as expressing the views of governments but not significant as to concrete, binding action by the United Nations.

Now, let me address myself briefly to the particular subjects that were discussed in the General Assembly and that caused the recent criticism. There was a great deal of talk about the tyranny of the majority because this new majority, which has taken shape in the General Assembly over the last 15 years with the near completion of the process of decolonization and creation of a very large number of new states, has given the so-called Third World a majority in the United Nations. On many matters they do not vote as a block but on certain matters on which they feel strongly they do vote as a block, and that leads to a majority action.

Also, I emphasize, except on procedural matters, merely a recommendation. But I do think it is only fair to recall that through the first 15 years of the United Nations the majority was made up by friends and associates of the United States, the Western Europeans, the Latin Americans. We had no scruples at all about mobilizing that majority to adopt very controversial resolutions which we favored, despite strong objection from the minority who claimed their needs were not adequately taken into account.

I cite Chinese representation, the representation of the North Koreans, the famous argument over the application of article 19 to the Soviets and the French. I do think that we should not be too self-righteous since we behaved in exactly the same way when we had the power to do so.

Now, the specific issues that caused the criticism were three in number. First was the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties, which the Mexican delegation has been presenting for some time and which was finally adopted by a vote of 120 with 6 against and 10 abstentions. That is a rather substantial vote. We objected and our grounds for objection may be reasonable. We thought there weren't adequate provisions for compensation when property was nationalized.

We thought there was too much encouragement of the formation of raw materials cartels. But the fact that 120 states felt so strongly that they overrode those objections indicates that we have got a real problem. It can't be swept under the rug and the fact that it was brought dramatically to our attention is probably an invaluable thing.

This represents, of course, the long-standing resentment of most of the less developed countries at what they consider to be inadequate assistance by the developed countries to their development, what they consider to be unfair terms of trade, which of course have inspired the oil producers to raise their prices so astronomically, and what they consider to be in many cases unfair practices by the multinational corporations.

So, again, this is a fact of life and while we may regret it, I don't think we can legitimately object to their expressing this view.

The second subject that aroused the most concern was that of the vote on South Africa. There the vote was 91 in favor, 22 against, and 19 abstentions. This was, I think, an improper action in the sense that it deprived the South African delegate of his seat in this Assembly even though one could hardly claim that his credentials from the South African Government were incorrect.

However, this reflected, of course, the bitter frustration of most of the nonwhite members over many, many years who have voted repeatedly for stronger action against apartheid in South Africa. I may say in many cases the United States has voted for these resolutions, but when it came to the application of sanctions or to the expulsion of South Africa we have balked and vetoed it.

So this vote, I think, represents an unwise but a not unnatural expression of deep and prolonged frustration at this violation of basic human rights.

Some have claimed the vote was a violation of the charter. I don't think it was a violation of the charter, though it followed certainly a procedure that is objectionable.

But when one speaks of violation of the charter in regard to southern African problems one must recall that the United States through the Byrd amendment has violated the decision of the Security Council, for which we voted, imposing sanctions on Rhodesia. This is in fact a violation of the charter. So once again we are not in a wholly sound position ourselves.

The final and most controversial issue was the treatment of the Palestine Liberation Organization. Again, I think this was unwise. This is the first time, except in the case of His Holiness the Pope, when a representative not of a government was allowed to take the podium in the General Assembly and in this case was given almost the treatment of a chief of state.

I say it was unwise but once again the vote was 105 in favor, 4 against, and 20 abstentions. Now, that is three-quarters of the membership.

Again, one must recognize that this was an expression of a very wild sentiment from those who think liberation organizations in general need more dignified treatment than they have always received and who think in this particular case the Palestinians have for 25 years been badly treated by the international community and that amends are owed to them.

More important, I think, this represents the fact that whether we like it or not, and we may not, the PLO has now become a fact of life; it has become an inescapable factor in the Middle Eastern equation. The fact that this was brought home to us by something that happened first at Rabat and then at the United Nations, is not all a bad thing because it warns us that the Palestinians can no longer be ignored, that if we want, as we do want, a settlement in the Middle East, a just settlement, that they are a factor that must be taken account of.

Finally, about the General Assembly, let me point out that even from a purely U.S. point of view, action in this General Assembly was not all bad. We got some very controversial questions decided in our favor.

The Cambodian and the Korean votes particularly were very hotly contested and we won, and I may say we didn't take much account of minority views there. We were very happy to have a slim majority with us.

On a more constructive note I think one must recognize that there is a growing feeling on the part of both the old majority that we used

to lead and the new majority which has emerged in recent years that this really isn't the best way to conduct business. While I am sure we will continue to have from time to time these lopsided votes on controversial matters that we won't like, I do notice the beginning of a tendency, which I think will grow, to try to reach consensus behind the scenes more earnestly and carefully than has always been the case in the past.

I have met a number of representative of less developed countries who have indicated that they think this would be wise and that they are going to make the effort to do so.

Now, finally, I would like to say a few words, which are elaborated on in the article in the Saturday Review that I asked to be put on record, as to why I think the United Nations and our participation in it continue to be very much in the U.S. national interest.

After all, we hear constantly nowadays the talk of world interdependence which means if it means anything that a great many more things are going to have to be done by a large number of nations working together than have been done in the past. In fact, most nations working together. That being the case, it would seem only logical to work through the institution where most nations are represented and which already has a whole series of agencies and programs dealing with most of these economic and social problems that we have somewhat belatedly recognized can be vital to our national interest, as well as the interest of others.

In the absence of trying to deal with them in a collective fashion between developed and developing countries, between the consumers and the producers of raw materials, we do risk having a very serious confrontation over a period of years between the two which could be just as damaging to our interests as the cold war was for many years. If we can avoid that by not weakening but strengthening the U.N. and its whole family of agencies where all of us are members, and seeing that it does more of the job rather than less of the job, I think we will be serving the national interest of the United States as well as the cause of rationality in international relations.

I need only mention not only the old responsibilities which we have long recognized were centered in the U.N., those of peaceful settlement and peacekeeping—and the United Nations has demonstrated in the last few months its continued capacity to perform a very useful service in peacekeeping in the Middle East—but we have this whole range of new problems in which the U.N. has been very active in the last year or so, has not in many cases produced solutions, but has produced the beginning of a dialog and in some cases effective action.

We have had year before last, the setting up of the U.N. Environment Program in Stockholm. We had last year the U.N. Food Conference in Rome. We had the Population Conference in Bucharest. We have the Law of the Sea Conference still going on.

In all of these respects we see precisely the sort of action by the world community that we should want to encourage. So if under these circumstances, because we are offended by some votes on politically sensitive matters in the United Nations, we should diminish our support of all of these international institutions, which are working in our interest just as much as in everybody else's, we would certainly be

cutting off our nose to spite our face. I very much hope that we don't do so.

Finally, let me add that I would hope that our support would not diminish but would increase and not only our political support but our financial support. It is not, as one would sometimes gather from reading articles in the press, any astronomical sum. The total budget of the entire U.N. family of agencies is only about \$1.3 billion which is approximately the cost of a single Trident submarine. The U.S. contribution to this total budget is about \$400 million, which is less than half of the cost of the New York City Police Department.

So one can hardly say that these sums are excessive in coping with this vast array of problems of global interdependence. I hope that that will be the conclusion of the Congress and the American people.

Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Ambassador Yost.

With the agreement of the witnesses, we would like to have each of the panel members give their statement and then proceed to the questions.

Ambassador Leonard.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES LEONARD, PRESIDENT, UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S.A.

Mr. LEONARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that you and a number of members of your committee are very well aware of what the U.N. Association is, but if I may make just a brief statement for the record on that subject.

Our object is to disseminate information on the United Nations and on other international bodies, to encourage support for a constructive U.S. role in these bodies and to encourage a more effective role for the U.N. itself in dealing with world problems.

I am very grateful, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to discuss attitudes in this country toward the United Nations.

I have a prepared statement. If I may, I will go through most of it, although there are some parts which are so very closely paralleled with what Ambassador Yost has just said that I will perhaps just ask you to enter them in the record, if that will be appropriate.

Mr. FRASER. Without objection, we will do that.

Mr. LEONARD. I should make it clear, Mr. Chairman, that I am not empowered by the members of the United Nations Association to speak for them. Many of them have expressed their views in individual letters or in resolutions of their local chapters, and I will be glad to make these available to the committee.

I know of no way to be sure authoritatively what the American people are thinking about the United Nations at this particular moment since there has not been, so far as I know, any current national sampling of opinion to which one could point. We do, however, in our organization attempt to keep in touch with American opinion toward the United Nations, and I believe there is a considerable amount of evidence for the judgments which I will offer you.

My basic proposition is the following: The people of the United States continue to support the United Nations. They feel that its existence and its activities are very much in our interest. Many Americans, in fact, would like to see it strengthened. But there are many

Americans who have been disturbed and unhappy over various developments last fall, particularly in the General Assembly and in the General Conference of UNESCO.

What is the evidence for this basic assessment? First of all, there was a scientific poll of American attitudes toward the United Nations published last July and conducted by the Harris survey. This survey found that a substantial 76 percent of the U.S. public agreed with the characterization that the U.N. is "worthwhile." This was a notable rise from the support which had been given the U.N. in a comparable survey in 1970.

A large number of Americans felt, however, that the organization was doing only a "fair" or even a "poor" job on one of its most important tasks, working for peace in the world. When the work of the organization was looked at area-by-area, the evaluation of the American people was generally positive, as indicated by the following quotations from the summary released by the Harris survey:

By 73-percent yes to 14-percent no, Americans agree that the U.N. "provides a forum for open, honest discussion between nations." The concept of bringing countries together to talk out differences is widely felt to be a healthy process.

I am quoting from what the Harris survey itself said about its poll.

By 65-percent yes to 17-percent no they also feel that the U.N. is "helping the poor countries develop their economies." Such aid to underdeveloped nations on the part of the U.N. has always been popular with the American people.

By 64-percent yes to 22-percent no they credit the world body with taking positive steps to keep the peace in the Middle East and elsewhere. Although highly controversial, the U.N. has served as a mediating and, at times, occupying force in Middle East peacemaking measures.

The proposition that "today's problems require international action that only the U.N. or other international agencies can take" is agreed to by a lopsided 63-18 percent. Clearly, the public would like to see such international efforts strengthened rather than weakened.

And that, of course, Mr. Chairman, is just the point that Ambassador Yost has just made.

Despite the disappointment and even the anger of many Americans over specific developments last fall, I know of no evidence that these positive attitudes were sharply altered. In fact, we have some evidence to the contrary.

First, financial support from American business firms for our organization, in spite of difficult business conditions, has been somewhat stronger than a year ago.

Second, there has not been any sharp change in the level of our membership. A few chapters have reported numerous resignations, but overall I believe our losses have been quite limited.

Third, the letters from individual members and the resolutions from our chapters have almost unanimously urged that the United States stay in the United Nations and work to make it stronger and more effective.

Fourth, we have some 150 national organizations associated with us. A number of them have expressed their views directly to the U.N. or to the U.S. Government on recent developments, but not one of these organizations has withdrawn from its affiliation with us, and a certain number have responded to a recent appeal to them for financial support with small contributions beyond their normal dues.

I have tried, Mr. Chairman, to read everything I could find in the way of editorial opinion throughout this country, myself, about the United Nations. Some of it has said quite bluntly that we should reduce our support for the organization or even get out of the U.N. The great majority of this editorial comment has, however, been directed to urging the U.N. to cease the various practices which the editorial writers felt were improper, and to become a more effective instrument for peace and justice.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the basically positive attitude of the U.S. public toward the United Nations has remained firm. It is combined with a rather realistic perception of the weaknesses in this structure which nations have so far built to manage relations among them.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the public wants the United States to help strengthen this structure. Among the evidence for this conclusion I would cite the following: The many thoughtful resolutions and letters which have come to us or to our attention have urged reform rather than U.S. withdrawal. A considerable amount of the negative criticism of the U.N. is directed to its weaknesses, to its inability to prevent wars from breaking out, and to the fact that its resolutions are often disregarded.

The United Nations is never, so far as I have observed, criticized for being too strong or for interfering in the internal affairs of this country or in the execution of our foreign policies. There are fairly frequent criticisms of the costs of the United Nations, but these criticisms are generally uninformed and assume that what the U.N. does can be done cheaper, rather than urging that the U.N. only do a part of what it is now doing.

The members of this committee are well aware that similar criticisms are constantly directed by the American people at our Federal, State, and city governments.

Finally, I think the American public has correctly seen that global problems such as food, population, energy, environment, oceans, the spread of nuclear weapons, and other security issues all require global management. The public sees that global management means either the U.N. as it exists at present or as it would have to be reinvented if for some reason we were to discard the present structure.

I then, Mr. Chairman, turn in this prepared statement to the causes of concern of the U.S. public which are just exactly what Ambassador Yost has just cited.

First, and most important, was the decision of the General Assembly to receive Yasir Arafat and then to give observer status to the PLO. Whatever may be the eventual judgment of history on the justice or the wisdom of these actions, I believe they have been judged by the "attentive public" in this country to be unjust and unwise. I am told that these actions evoked an unusual flood of mail directed to the U.N. Secretariat—some 8,000 letters, almost all of them negative. The U.S. Mission and our organization also received mail which was predominantly hostile. And many of our UNA chapters adopted resolutions deploring these events.

Second, I would cite the actions of the UNESCO General Conference last fall. I recognize that the actual situation underlying these UNESCO actions was complex and unclear. I frankly do not think it was well reported in the American press.

Many Americans think that Israel was expelled from UNESCO and were outraged that that could happen. Even though Israel was not expelled but was denied admission to the European Regional Group, as the United States had been denied for many years, the various acts of the General Conference were clearly unwise and designed to punish Israel.

Many letters, editorials, et cetera, have cited these UNESCO actions along with those related to the PLO as evidence that the U.N. is behaving in an improper fashion.

Third, there was the suspension of South Africa from the 29th General Assembly. Reaction to this development was less clearcut than in the preceding cases. The action itself was almost certainly illegal, but many supporters of the United Nations can understand the exasperation of the African states over the unwillingness of leading powers, particularly the United States, to support meaningful pressures on South Africa. Many U.N. supporters recall the long U.S. disregard for the principle of universality in the case of China.

Moreover, many Americans are reluctant to lecture the Africans on legality at a time when the United States is clearly disregarding its charter obligation to respect the Security Council prohibition on importing Rhodesian chrome. Thus, the South African affair has been a reason, but a rather secondary reason, for public irritation with the last General Assembly.

Finally, there are various actions of the Third World majority in the U.N. on economic issues, particularly the resolutions of the Sixth Special Session last spring and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties passed this fall. These issues are not widely understood and they are only occasionally cited in protest letters, resolutions, and editorials.

In a way, this is regrettable, since the incipient cold war between the Third World majority and the developed countries who form a very wealthy and powerful minority in the U.N. is an extremely important and basic problem. This cold war, which seems to be replacing the old cold war between East and West, has much to do with our lack of success in the U.N. on other issues, such as, for example, mustering political support for Israel.

I think these are the elements of current dissatisfaction and yet of basic strength in the U.S. public attitude toward the United Nations.

Your letter didn't specifically ask me, Mr. Chairman, what to do about this but if I may I will just offer a brief comment. The U.N. is a basically political organization. It has many technical elements like the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, but at its core in the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, and other plenary bodies it operates much like any other political body.

The General Assembly is not a lawmaking body like the House of Representatives but its resolutions do over time have a certain effect on events, greater or lesser according to circumstances.

Like other political bodies, it is imperfect. Some of its members do not truly represent their constituents but act at times on behalf of special interests or even out of personal motives. But in a broad way a U.N. vote tells us something about world opinion. I think recent U.N. votes are telling the United States that it is time to rethink some of our basic policies and positions.

I will not try to go into detail, but will only say that I think that U.S. policies in the economic field, which were cited more specifically by Ambassador Yost, or in many cases our lack of a clear policy, have led a large number of governments of the Third World to approach each issue at the U.N., whether it is economic or political or legal or technical, with something of a sense of grievance toward the United States. Thus, a certain number of votes on the PLO question were, I believe, cast for reasons which had little to do with Israel, but quite a bit to do with the U.S. position in the world.

I know it is difficult for Americans to believe that with our truly generous record—and our generosity is widely acknowledged—there is any good reason for other countries to be suspicious or resentful of us. But if we can approach this matter with an open mind, analyze the situations which lie behind these dissatisfactions, and try to do a serious job of mobilizing political support for constructive, creative solutions to world problems—as we just did at the recent World Food Conference—then we can transform the United Nations into an instrument which serves our interests and the interests of people everywhere even more effectively than the present imperfect but very worthwhile structure.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much.

That was an interesting speech. The third witness is Rosemary Ginn, chairman, U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

STATEMENT OF ROSEMARY GINN, CHAIRMAN, U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

Mrs. GINN. Mr. Chairman, distinguished Congresslady and Congressmen, I am Rosemary Ginn of Columbia, Mo. I am the chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

May I thank the chairman, his colleagues and his staff for inviting the U.S. Commission to be represented at these hearings. It is a thoughtful gesture on the committee's part and I wish to take this opportunity to express the Commission's appreciation for this courtesy.

My remarks will be limited to the specialized agency of the United Nations, UNESCO. I leave to more expert witnesses the broader questions of the United Nations which concern this committee. Yet it is understood that the problems within UNESCO are problems which are present in the United Nations, and could perhaps constitute a threat to the well-being of the entire U.N. system.

I propose to describe the U.S. Commission and its work, the actions taken by the general conference of UNESCO—which have prompted the recent restrictive legislation by the Congress of the United

States—and the potential loss to the United States which may result from that action.

The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO and its work: The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO is a congressionally authorized advisory and information body of 100 members, appointed by the Secretary of State. Sixty members are nongovernmental organizations interested in, or related to, the fields of UNESCO's concerns—education, science, culture, and communications. Forty members are individuals, 25 of them appointed from various levels of Federal, State, and local government, and the remaining 15 are members at large. I am a member at large. The list of the membership of the Commission is in your hands.

The Federal Government is replete with many citizens' advisory bodies some of which do advise, and others merely concur. The U.S. National Commission for UNESCO is truly an adviser to the U.S. Government.

For example, much of the American environmental policy which played a decisive role in UNESCO and at the Stockholm environmental meeting had its origins in the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. The Commission held in 1969 in San Francisco what is generally regarded as the first national conference on the environmental crisis.

Later the Commission developed and put forward an American position on UNESCO's approach to the environmental problem, a position which today underlies the international organization's basic policy, called "Man and the Biosphere."

The U.S. policy for UNESCO pertaining to international women's year was developed by the leadership within the U.S. Commission for UNESCO and its task force on IWY.

The Commission has also advised the State Department on other important matters, among them such things as the use of satellites for education and culture—a most critical international policy item—and on equally vital matters of public concern such as the role of education in the drug abuse problem.

The Commission is responsible, along with the UNESCO liaison office at the United Nations, for information about UNESCO in the United States. One of our most recent publications is "UNESCO and the U.S. National Interest" of which you have a copy.

In addition to its advisory and informational functions, the National Commission also conducts broad program activities in fields of vital interest to the American public, such as energy conservation, drug abuse control, environmental education, learning centers for disadvantaged American children, and others.

I cite the works of the U.S. Commission, not so much to sing the praises of an organization of which I serve as chairman, but rather to give examples in which UNESCO-related Commission endeavors are beneficial to U.S. interest.

Now may I turn to the actions of the 18th session of the General Conference of UNESCO held in Paris, October 17 to November 23, 1974.

I attended this conference as a member of the U.S. delegation, and at that time I was a vice chairman of the U.S. Commission for UNESCO.

During the general conference, more than 500 resolutions in the fields of education, science, culture, and communications were acted upon. The United States put forward a number of these. In most instances we were successful in obtaining their adoption. However, in what proved to be the most unfortunate issue of the general conference—the resolutions directed against Israel—we were unsuccessful. For it was the United States which led the efforts to prevent passage of these resolutions and we were unable to muster enough votes to defeat them.

With regard to these resolutions, however, there has been much misinformation and misinterpretation about the actions taken by the general conference.

There were two resolutions passed at the heart of the controversy in UNESCO. The first one dealt with the preservation of monuments in Jerusalem. The second one was concerned with the application of Israel to join the European regional group.

The Jerusalem resolution originated within the Commission III of the General Conference on UNESCO's cultural programs relating in particular to the preservation of historical and cultural monuments, such as Jerusalem, Philae, Nubia, and others.

This resolution was the outgrowth of prior resolutions in the United Nations and UNESCO, calling upon Israel—and I quote from the resolution:

... to desist from any archeological excavations in the city of Jerusalem and from any modifications of its features or its cultural and historical character, particularly with regard to Christian and Islamic religious sites.

To the U.S. Government, the Department of State and the U.S. Delegation, the Arab-Moslem draft resolution went beyond the limit necessary, because it involved a specific sanction against a member of state and we viewed it as a far reaching and discriminatory act unwarranted by the circumstances.

During the preparation for the debate and vote on this resolution, there was concerted action and vigorous opposition by the Department of State, the U.S. permanent delegation to UNESCO in Paris, the U.S. delegation to the Conference and the other countries which supported the position of Israel.

Most of the Western European countries, a large number of Latin American states and other members joined in voting against the sanction on Jerusalem. The resolution was actually passed by less than a majority, 59 in favor, 34 against and 24 abstentions.

In regard to the second resolution concerning Israel's membership in a region, I refer to a statement published in the January 1975 issue of UNESCO Courier given by UNESCO Director General Amadou Mahtar M'Bow on the resolutions relating to Israel. It is of the greatest essence that you read this statement with the greatest of care. My time limitation does not grant the opportunity to go through it in detail, but it contains facts which you must have in your deliberations, and it, too, is in your hands.

I quote from the attached M'Bow statement:

Israel has neither been ousted from UNESCO nor from any regional group within the organization. Israel continues to be a member of UNESCO as one of the 135 members states,...

and Israel can participate as an observer, as it has done in the past, at any regional conference of ministers no matter where it is held.

Israel also continues to be listed for elections to the executive board in group I, Western Europe, on the same footing as Australia, Canada, the United States of America and New Zealand.

As a footnote, the committee should know that the United States and Canada had expressed interest in being a part of a regional program group for nearly 10 years before they were admitted, while Israel had expressed interest for only 1 year.

May we now consider the reaction of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO in regard to the action of the General Conference.

It is clearly spelled out in the resolution unanimously passed at the annual meeting which was held in December of 1974. It is included as an attachment to this statement. The resolution sharply deplores the action of the UNESCO General Conference, condemns the political turn which it has brought to UNESCO, and urges the Director General of UNESCO to seek ways of mending the breach that has come within and without the organization.

Next among your documents you will find my statement listing some of the losses the United States might sustain if the United States were to withdraw from UNESCO. Such withdrawal, I am convinced, would result in a whole catalog of disadvantages to the United States, to many of its institutions and organizations, and to a large number of private citizens who have individual interests in UNESCO and benefit from their various associations with its work.

For instance, withdrawal would deprive the American scientific community of its major facility for international cooperation research and development. It would deprive vast numbers of individuals and nongovernmental organizations of the cheapest and most efficient instrument available internationally for the conduct of their exchange affairs. It would cut us off from much of the essential pioneer work being undertaken internationally in the vital field of solar energy. It would place us outside of similarly vital work UNESCO is conducting in the environmental research and monitoring sectors of the world environmental crisis.

These are but three or four of the essential losses the United States would sustain if we were to be divorced from UNESCO, and they and others are amplified in the attachment which I have included, and this, too, is among your documents and I hope, sir, that this as well as all of the attachments which I have offered can become a part of the record.²

Mr. FRASER. Without objection, we will incorporate as many of them as appear to be appropriate in the record.

Mrs. GINN. Thank you.

Gentlemen, I have reviewed the U.S. Commission and its work, the relevant actions of the General Conference of UNESCO, and what in the U.S. interest would be lost in our refusal to continue as a member of UNESCO.

I would be remiss if I did not call to your attention the new Director General of UNESCO. He is M. Amadou Mahtar M'Bow, a dis-

² For material submitted by Mrs. Ginn, see pp. 97-103.

tinguished black scholar from Senegal and the first African to head a United Nations specialized agency. He is deeply concerned with the management and revitalization of the organization. His is the Third World voice of moderation and reason.

We worked hard to get him elected and now he needs our support.

The U.S. Commission for UNESCO is grateful for your concern. We believe that the Congress does not wish to harm UNESCO, but recognizes the presence of vital long-term interests of the United States involved. It is our hope that you will determine that the best course for the United States is to make possible a continued strong participation in UNESCO.

This brief presentation can only bring you the barest outline of the factors in this determination, for the Jerusalem question has been a part of our world heritage for thousands of years. Whatever additional information and assistance we may provide for you we are ready to serve.

I think perhaps the lesson we might learn from this experience is that the United States, instead of turning away, should do more to involve our American people in the quiet good works of the United Nations system, particularly the educational, scientific, and cultural organization, UNESCO.

The U.S. National Commission is most appreciative of this opportunity to appear before you and I gratefully acknowledge your thoughtful interest.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. FRASER. Thank you very much, Mrs. Ginn.

Let me ask you, if I may, I will direct this to the whole panel, what is your understanding of the effect of the amendment as adopted by the Congress last fall? You are familiar with the provisions?

Mrs. GINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRASER. What do you understand its effect to be, both in terms of whether it affects voluntary or assessed contributions and what would be required in order that the withholding of funds come to an end or not take effect?

Mrs. GINN. Would either of you gentlemen care to answer?

Well, you must understand that I bring you a total curbstone opinion. I speak only as an individual who has read the amendments and in my opinion the effect is that the United States is refusing to pay its legally accepted assessment to UNESCO and that under the present statement that exists in that amendment there is no money under that source or any other that can be used for UNESCO or anything related to UNESCO.

Mr. FRASER. That prohibition would apply both to the assessed payment as well as the voluntary contribution?

Mrs. GINN. It is my understanding, sir. I don't know that there has been a legal opinion given by anybody on that but that is my understanding.

Mr. FRASER. I think I understood that our payment is due around April or sometime this spring.

Mrs. GINN. Shortly, yes.

Mr. FRASER. Shortly.

Mrs. GINN. Yes.

MR. FRASER. There was a contingent provision. That is, it said until or unless the President makes a finding that UNESCO will stay within the charter, or something of that kind.

MRS. GINN. Yes.

MR. FRASER. What do you understand the practical effect of that to be? What would the President have to find in practical terms in order to avoid the prohibition?

MRS. GINN. Well, it appears to me—and of course it is very difficult to empathize oneself into the position of the President—but he would be required to make a judgment on the actions of the General Conference, which of course is a body which has adjourned, and he would be required to say that they had—I assume it was the understanding of the Congress that different results to the specific resolutions which caused the problems would be placed in force, namely, in regard to the Jerusalem resolution, and this of course having been passed by an autonomous body at the General Conference would be very difficult to do and very difficult for the President to ascertain that it had been done.

MR. FRASER. In other words, your understanding is that the President in effect has to be able to report that these resolutions or actions have been rescinded or reversed?

MRS. GINN. That is my understanding of it, sir. Or at least it may be that it says that positive steps have been taken to assure that UNESCO is doing thus and so.

MR. FRASER. So it might be prospective in nature, however. It may not necessarily require revision or reconsideration of the action—

MRS. GINN. Of course that would be a matter that the Congress would have to determine, what positive steps would mean insofar as their needs were concerned.

MR. FRASER. Except I think this is a Presidential determination, not one that Congress makes.

I don't mean to press you on it but I was just wondering what understanding you had of the effect of the language.

MRS. GINN. Well, the effect is pretty devastating.

MR. FRASER. Are there ways to your knowledge in which assurance might be created that these kinds of actions won't happen again?

The Chief of the General Conference isn't going to pass a resolution that it doesn't like—

MRS. GINN. Well, sir, in the democratic process you have to accept the decision of a majority in any kind of situation and I can't see any way that UNESCO could determine that there might not be other resolutions on other subjects which might not be entirely to our liking, just as Ambassador Yost I am sure would have the same feeling about the General Assembly.

MR. FRASER. Let me turn to the question here of the nature of decisions by the UNESCO Conference. For example, with respect to the exclusion of South Africa from the last General Assembly, my impression is that there is a rather strong argument to be made that this exceeded the authority of the General Assembly under the charter; there was no proper legal basis for such an exclusion.

So one can argue that the Assembly exceeded its powers and thereby puts the whole adherence to the rule of law at some risk.

Can it be argued that any of the actions of the UNESCO Conference exceeded their authority?

Mrs. GINN. I don't know that you could say that they have exceeded their authority. They created a wedge between UNESCO and one of its member states and this, of course, is the greatest damage that it does to the institution itself.

Mr. FRASER. In other words, what you are saying is that what they did wasn't necessarily a violation of the provisions under which they operate, but rather that it reflected perhaps more of a political judgment on the part of members which is not presumably an appropriate consideration to come into force in UNESCO.

Am I close to the problem?

Mrs. GINN. Yes, that is partially it, but you must remember that it was a cumulative attitude and if this resolution were out of bounds and were illegal, so were all of the others that have been passed since 1967 upon which this one was based.

Mr. FRASER. No. Well, I gather from what you say you don't think what they said was illegal but it may have been improvident in that it injected a political issue.

Mrs. GINN. I agree. I cannot think it was illegal but it was improvident.

Mr. FRASER. Because it brought in political considerations which presumably are not a function of the UNESCO undertaking.

Mrs. GINN. Correct.

Mr. FRASER. I wonder if the other witnesses would comment on this question. Is this comparable to the exclusion of South Africa?

Mr. YOST. I really haven't studied the UNESCO action closely but my view from what I know about it would accord with yours. The UNESCO action was of somewhat a different character.

There was nothing illegal about it but it was unwise, unwise primarily to introduce political questions into this organization which is supposed to be nonpolitical dealing with quite different sorts of problems.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Leonard.

Mr. LEONARD. I have not heard a suggestion anywhere that the UNESCO action was in a strict sense illegal, but rather as Ambassador Yost said, improper in introducing elements which don't belong in deliberations of that body.

Mr. FRASER. Well, how can the President give assurance that this won't happen again?

Mr. LEONARD. I have not studied the amendment, the provision of law in any detail. In fact, I don't think I have really read it verbatim. But it is my understanding that it is very, very difficult for the State Department and the President to find that UNESCO is coming into compliance with the provisions laid down there in such a way that they can certify as the amendment requires.

Mr. FRASER. Finally, I have the impression that the days when the plague was prevalent, when we have had other highly contagious diseases, that one of the remedies was to burn the houses down, but there was good reason for that.

My own impression is a little bit that the U.N. is more like a piece of chopping the head off the messenger who brings the bad news. that

the U.N. forum provides the place in which we get the bad news that some of our policies don't seem to be well thought of in the world community and therefore we attack not this problem but the organization which produces the opportunity for those views to be made public.

Mr. YOST. I would think that is very much the case, Mr. Chairman. As I see it, in regard to the disputed resolutions, it wasn't really the U.N. that was acting in a particular way. It was 90 or 100 or whatever number of governments expressing a view which we happen to strongly disagree with. It was their view. The fact that it was reflected in the U.N. doesn't change the situation on the ground.

Mr. FRASER. If we destroy that United Nations, does that give us assurance that we will have altered the views of the nations that don't seem to agree with our views?

Mr. YOST. Not at all, and they would no doubt behave as they see fit—

Mr. ROSENTHAL. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. Chairman, by way of being the devil's advocate, if you eliminated the forum, then those views would not get the public attention that they get under the auspices of the U.N. In other words, these views are amplified to a greater degree than if they were unilaterally proclaimed by any one nation.

Mr. YOST. This is certainly true, Congressman; no question about it. But I think one can argue that if there is a situation in a particular area which we may dislike intensely, but it nevertheless is a situation which we must take into account, there is no particular reason why we should mind it being widely publicized.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me give an example. When you get the picture, either on television or in newspapers, of Arafat approaching the dais and the cheering Delegates, you have institutionalized something. If you didn't have that meeting room, that kind of picture couldn't be telegraphed around the world. You would have individual countries expressing their views, but when they gathered together, there was a particular expression of those views.

Mr. YOST. Well, that is certainly true, but I merely—

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Of all the legislative bodies I have ever seen anywhere, either in this country or elsewhere, I have never seen a scene of that type visually expressed to hundreds of millions of people around the world.

We have our moments in the House of Representatives that one might look with askance at, but I can honestly tell you, in all the years I have been here—about 13—I have never seen that kind of a hooting, hollering, hysteria over that kind of an event.

Mr. YOST. Well, it is true, but that does reflect a strong emotion, which, as I say, we disagree with—

Mr. ROSENTHAL. It is emotion multiplied by the conglomeration. In other words, in trying to understand why people are critical of the United Nations is that it brings together those who want an opportunity to be physically together in one view in which their views are amplified and given much greater expression than if they were individually expressed by a foreign minister in a home country somewhere.

Mr. YOST. Well, of course, these groups would be meeting in narrower forums, such as Rabat, for example, in any case. They would get as you say less publicity but the same views would be expressed.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Also, their views get a certain seriousness of purpose by being in that building and that chamber, a chamber for which we have had great respect.

Mr. YOST. I think, as I remarked in my statement, Mr. Congressman, even the assembly—which I emphasize is not a legislative body in the sense of passing legislation, it merely makes recommendation—is useful in the sense that it does enable us to register what the opinions of the member governments are. From time to time we will find ourselves in strong disagreement with them just as others do, but at least we know what they are.

As Dag Hammarskjöld used to say, it is the world as it is whether you like it or not.

Mr. WOLFF. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRASER. Could we just perhaps have further response, if any, to Mr. Rosenthal's question? Mr. Gilman has to leave and he wanted to get a question in.

Mr. WOLFF. I just wanted to ask a question of Ambassador Yost about member governments.

What government did Mr. Arafat represent?

Mr. YOST. No, no; I was speaking of the members of the General Assembly, not of Mr. Arafat.

Mr. WOLFF. I am sorry.

Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Leonard.

Mr. LEONARD. I don't want to take Mr. Gilman's time, but I would like to make a further comment on what Mr. Rosenthal said.

He has a valid point in that there are ways in which the whole structure of the organization works in a negative fashion, negative with respect to whatever reasonable objectives we, or others, might posit as being the reasons for having a world structure. I could cite many more examples, and Ambassador Yost could, from our own experience in the U.N., where the procedures simply do not serve positive objectives, but overall it is very much in our interest to have this structure more or less as it is. Therefore we simply have to, in our mind, accept these specific losses in certain areas for the sake of having the overall structure that does serve our interest.

I think that in time changes can be made and reforms can be brought about. But I think we should recognize that those reforms cannot be brought about at this moment because of the particular nature of the situation. We ourselves, the Western countries, set up the structure that is there and we laid down the rules, modeling them pretty much on our own parliamentary procedures, and now, when they have begun to work in a way we and others see as against our interest, is not the moment to suggest that those be altered in any very radical or important way.

I think that moment will come and we can then, in an atmosphere of conciliation, work out better procedures and better ways of doing the things that are done there. But I am afraid for the moment, we just have to sort of duck our heads while the storm goes on.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity of being called out of order.

Mr. FRASER. You are in order.

Mr. GILMAN. I regret that this hearing comes at a time when we have such an important issue on the floor and all of our time is limited today. This subject is important to us, and most of our constituents, and the validity of our continuation of our Nation's role in the U.N. For that reason, I think it is important that we explore some of these issues with you.

With relation to the UNESCO resolution, can I ask what sort of an investigation was conducted by the UNESCO with regard to the charges leveled against Israel concerning the archeological diggings?

Mrs. GINN. The Director General appointed an expert, highly respected, archeologist who went to Israel and made a very careful and thorough investigation of the situation as he found it, and he reported that to the Director General and the Director General gave a special report to us in the Cultural Commission on the findings of the gentleman's report.

Mr. GILMAN. And who was the investigator?

Mrs. GINN. I cannot give you his name. I am sorry.

Mr. GILMAN. Is that Professor Lemaire?

Mrs. GINN. Yes.

Mr. GILMAN. Has that report been made public at all?

Mrs. GINN. There was a limited report that was available to us at the Conference.

Mr. GILMAN. I understand that the Lemaire report was a very favorable report to what Israel was doing.

Mrs. GINN. I didn't feel that it was unfavorable. I felt that there were some areas where he felt that they might have done some things differently and maybe with a little bit more care, but overall, it was a very fair presentation of what he had found.

Mr. GILMAN. You have read the report?

Mrs. GINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILMAN. Based upon the report, did you feel that there was substance to the charges that were being leveled by UNESCO?

Mrs. GINN. I didn't get that feeling from it. It seemed to me like they are doing, under the circumstances, as well as they could, and I didn't have any feeling that the report condemned Israel. It didn't praise nor did it condemn.

Mr. GILMAN. And how many members voted on the UNESCO resolution?

Mrs. GINN. It was not a majority. I think I gave you that figure in the statement. That was 59 yes, 34 no, and 24 abstained, so you see the action was not really a majority vote.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. When you said you couldn't give the name of the author of the report—

Mrs. GINN. Mr. Gilman, excuse me, sir.

I want to be sure that I have made a correct statement. The report, the Lemaire report which I read, was the summary. It was not the whole report.

Mr. GILMAN. Has anyone on the Commission seen the whole report?

Mrs. GINN. To my knowledge; no.

Mr. GILMAN. Why is that being withheld?

Mrs. GINN. It was the position of the Director General, and what his reasons were for withholding it, I do not know.

Mr. GILMAN. Is that available to members of this body?

Mrs. GINN. I don't know that it would be.

Mr. GILMAN. Could you make a request for it?

Mrs. GINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILMAN. And if it is available, would you submit it to us?

Mrs. GINN. I would.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, without objection, if that report could be made part of our hearing.

Mr. FRASER. If I understand Mrs. Ginn's statement it was that the report did not appear to condemn Israel.

Mrs. GINN. I didn't have the feeling that it did. Now this is the summary report of the visit which I read.

Mr. GILMAN. And that is UNESCO's investigator that was sent to Israel, an archeologist?

Mrs. GINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRASER. Without objection, we will incorporate it into the record.⁴

Mrs. Meyner.

Mrs. MEYNER. I would like to thank our panelists for a very fine presentation and I would like to move maybe into a broader aspect of this and ask you what concrete measures you think can be undertaken in the United Nations or what concrete measures the United States can take within the United Nations to remove recent irritants.

That is a tough one, I know, and a broad question, but I think it is an important one.

Mr. Yost. Well, I did mention briefly in passing that I thought there was beginning to develop an inclination both among the developed and developing countries to try a little harder to avoid confrontation and to work out consensus on at least some of these controversial matters. I would expect that to be a slow process and I wouldn't at all expect that it would avoid further irritants of this kind from time to time.

I think, as someone said, the General Assembly is a political body and you can expect them to act politically, but there is a recognition that if the U.N. is to be effective this must not be overdone. I think we will find among many of the more responsible people on both sides more of an effort to reach agreement behind the scenes in private discussions before resolutions are brought out and put to a vote.

Now we have got to show the same willingness, of course, and not follow the practice we have so often in the past of mobilizing support and ramming through resolutions we like over the bodies of minorities that object strongly. It has got to be a two-way street. But that, I think, is the general line that one should try and follow.

But I do repeat that the more important areas for constructive work are not at the General Assembly but the Security Council, on the one hand, and the whole range of economic bodies on the other.

⁴ The office of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO subsequently informed the subcommittee that the report referred to is unavailable. However, a statement by the Director General on Israel's participation in UNESCO appears in the appendix on p. 101.

Mrs. MEYNER. Thank you.

Mrs. GINN. May I offer a postscript?

From where I sit the first thing that we can do is to stay there. That is the first thing that we can do that will make a contribution to solving the problem. If we leave we have no way to work on behalf of our own interests and our allies.

Second, we need to offer strong positions of program leadership because if there was one message that came to us in the General Conference it was, they would welcome strong leadership in ideas and positions from the United States.

I think that, if you don't mind, sir, that that is the crux of the matter to me.

Mr. YOST. Yes.

May I, Mr. Chairman, say amen to that? I think the fact is that during the first 15 or maybe 20 years of U.N. existence the United States adopted a very positive attitude of leadership. While we failed in some cases, on the whole the U.N. was quite an effective organization.

I think our support and leadership has somewhat slackened in recent years and what we see there is partly a consequence of that.

Mrs. MEYNER. Thank you.

Mr. LEONARD. If I could just add to that a quote from a speech Ambassador Scali made the other day. He said: "Even the most vigorous and imaginative efforts cannot insure success. But a half-hearted America can insure defeat." It is my feeling that what we have had really is a half-hearted participation in the United Nations and in a whole series of United Nations bodies, and that is just a sure prescription for our coming out badly in the overall process, and my urging would be exactly parallel to that of my two colleagues here, that we go into it with a very positive approach here; that we give it the best leadership that we possibly can in a positive spirit.

Mr. FRASER. Congressman Rosenthal.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Ambassador Yost, when and how did our leadership slacken?

Mr. YOST. Well, my impression is that it slackened slowly through the middle and latter sixties for a number of reasons.

In the first place, there was a great deal of criticism in United Nations' bodies about our participation in Vietnam. This annoyed, angered, many of our leaders at the time and caused them to depreciate the U.N. and tend to do less U.S. business through the U.N. and more outside it.

Then, of course, the fact we did lose our easy majorities there with this great influx of new states from Africa and Asia which created a new majority meant that we had to work a lot harder. We didn't win as consistently as we had in the past, and that discouraged and upset other people.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Tell me in specific terms, taking into account these historical facts and trends, how do you correct it as of today?

You are the President of the United States. What do you do, A, B, C, D?

Mr. YOST. In general I would instruct the Secretary of State and others concerned with international affairs that, rather than commencing to cope with a given problem bilaterally or in some small

group of our close friends, in each case he should first see whether there is not some United Nations agency that might be in a position to deal with it. If there is, in the first instance deal through that agency, whether it be the Security Council or Economic Social Council or one of the economic agencies or whatnot. Only if that agency proves to be ineffective, or if there isn't any appropriate agency for dealing with that particular problem, such as an agreement on strategic arms, should one commence with a bilateral approach.

Now, I say this is in general because obviously there have to be all sorts of exceptions.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Could you give me an example where that wasn't done and could have been done and might have made a difference?

Mr. YOST. I think myself that we missed an opportunity at the Special Session of the U.N. General Assembly last year which was originally summoned to deal with the oil problem but was expanded to include development problems generally.

Our approach was that we must first create unity among consumers before we face the producers in a general dialog. Well, a whole year has gone by and the dialog hasn't happened yet. We are still talking about it. I hope it will take place before long.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. And you disagree with that policy?

Mr. YOST. Yes. My belief is that had we gone into this special session with determination to try to work out something between producers and consumers of oil and perhaps other commodities as well, obviously we wouldn't have accomplished very much in those few weeks but we would have gotten a dialog started in a larger forum. This might have avoided a good many of the confrontations that have subsequently taken place. We might be now a year later, nearly a year later, with a common program worked out. I hope we may have such a program at the end of this year, but much later than we otherwise might have.

So that is one concrete example.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am just trying to think what the Secretary of State's response would be; probably, that he is having enough difficulty getting the consuming nations to agree on a program, not to speak of 113 nations.

Mr. YOST. I know. It is a matter of tactics and style and I happen to think that by concentrating exclusively on getting our friends to agree and failing to bring in the other side we have built up an atmosphere of confrontation which is unnecessary and which makes the solution of the problem more difficult.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Have our bilateral relations deteriorated with, for example, Africa and other Third World areas and countries with the net effect that it is more difficult for us to operate in the United Nations?

Mr. YOST. As I did remark in my statement, and I think my colleagues here made the same point, we have taken less account than we should have in recent years of the economic needs of the developing countries both in regard to aid programs and in regard to trade arrangements, and perhaps in regard to treatment of multinational corporations. This has built up a feeling of some resentment against the United States which has overcome the almost universal feeling some years ago that we were very generous and understanding.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. What I am really trying to get at is can you win friends and influence people in the United Nations by improving bilateral relations? For example, if you increase your economic and political activity in Africa, for example, would that create a more favorable climate in the voting operation in the United Nations?

Mr. YOST. It certainly would. You can't expect a one-for-one response and if you try to tie the two together too obviously you would increase resentment. But in fact if you are following economic policies that the African countries felt were more forthcoming and more understanding and more helpful, this would affect their entire attitude toward us.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. And yet on another scenario, Israel had done a great deal in some countries in Africa in terms of technical assistance—in Uganda for example—and that didn't do much good after the tide started to turn against them in the United Nations.

Mr. YOST. Yes. There, of course, are emotional political issues involved there. As soon as anyone is able to get themselves labeled a liberation movement it creates an automatically favorable response from most Africans. They of course are most concerned with liberation movements in southern Africa, but they tend to associate them all in their minds.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is what I am actually getting at.

For example, can any OAU vote with us when the liberation trend is going the other way?

Mr. YOST. Well, maybe not. On some issues I would doubt that they could. Our influence might well reach so far as to induce them to moderate their expressions and cause them to change their minds.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You mean vote, but not cheer?

Mr. YOST. Maybe avoid a vote in some cases.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Is it now not sort of the automatic thing to do for Third World countries to automatically vote against the United States?

Mr. YOST. Well, no. I think that would be an exaggeration.

I have also pointed out in my statement that even in this last Assembly we were able to get majorities on two very sensitive and critical issues: Cambodia and Korea. Obviously, a good many Third World countries had to vote on our side that way.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am curious. Why do you think they did that?

Mr. YOST. A certain number of them thought their own interests coincided more or less with ours.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You mean there are floating coalitions that we could develop and if we had better bilateral relations we could take advantage of these floating coalitions as they develop?

Mr. YOST. The less developed countries vote as a block only on a relatively small number of issues. They happen to be issues that they are deeply concerned with but they are a relatively small number.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Do any of them vote because they feel they have to for domestic political reasons?

Mr. YOST. Sure It stems in some cases from a fairly long-standing resentment about these economic problems. I don't think in most cases there is any strong political feeling against the United States.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. You see, because in Africa, for example, we had clean hands. We had not been one of the colonial powers such as France, Great Britain, or Belgium.

Mr. YOST. But while we have voted in general for many of the resolutions in regard to southern African problems that they feel so intensively about, until the recent change of government in Portugal there has been very little effect of any of those resolutions. There still is practically no effect as far as South Africa and even Rhodesia is concerned.

So, they don't feel that we have gone anywhere nearly as far with them as they would like us to.

Now, we have very good reasons for not wishing to go that far. Nevertheless, that is a basic difference of interest.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Wolff.

Mr. WOLFF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have been reading the statements that were made prior to my coming in and I notice on this UNESCO resolution on Jerusalem it says "The resolution originated within Commission III of the General Conference on UNESCO's cultural programs relating in particular to the preservation of historical and cultural monuments."

I wonder whether or not there were any resolutions or anything like that that the United States interposed prior to that meeting in 1967 so far as Jerusalem is concerned. Would you know that?

Mrs. GINN. Sir, my involvement only has a history of 4 years, so it won't go back far enough and I cannot tell you what the United States did in regard to the resolutions that were offered from 1967 on.

Mr. WOLFF. What I am getting at is, Were there any resolutions for the desecration of historical monuments in Jerusalem prior to the situation as it exists today? As I understand it, there was quite a bit of desecration that took place prior to 1967. I am just wondering whether there were any resolutions. Maybe other members of the panel could comment.

Mr. YOST. I am afraid I don't know. I have not heard of any.

Mr. WOLFF. We do know—in fact, I was in Jerusalem prior to 1967 and I found a great amount of desecration taking place on monuments that had great historical and religious significance, but there never seemed to be any finger pointed at the perpetrators and I was wondering whether the United States had injected itself at that time or not?

I will pass that and go on to another point. Do you know whether the People's Republic of China is in any of the ancillary organizations of the United Nations?

Mrs. GINN. Yes, UNESCO.

Mr. WOLFF. How about the World Health Organization? I understand that they were dismissed from the World Health Organization.

Mr. YOST. I don't know the exact score now. They have been dropped from most of the U.N. organizations following the action of the General Assembly a few years ago.

Mr. WOLFF. As I understand it, the General Assembly recognized the People's Republic as a member. Does that mean all of the other organizations that surround the United Nations have dropped the Republic of China?

Mr. Yost. It doesn't necessarily, but it obviously has a strong effect. Most of them have followed the example of the General Assembly.

Mr. WOLFF. What would the panel's recommendation be on that, the idea of the Republic of China's representation in organizations like the World Health Organization?

Mr. Yost. As I think you know, Congressman, the People's Republic of China has taken the position, rightly or wrongly, that they won't sit in an organization with what they call the representatives of Taiwan.

Mr. WOLFF. Suppose some organizations decide they wouldn't sit with the United States?

Mr. Yost. Yes, I know. I am not defending that position. I am just saying it is their position. After many years of refusing to accept that position the United Nations—first General Assembly with U.S. support ultimately—

Mr. WOLFF. What I am getting at is the fact that we do find political considerations are entering not only this situation but others as well with the ancillary organizations of the United Nations.

I think this is one of the areas that troubles those of us who have been supportive of the United Nations and its organizations; it is what some of us take exception to at the present time.

Mr. Yost. There was a feeling that grew over the years that while many might have wished both Peking and Taiwan to be represented, if that wasn't possible, if it had to be one or the other, it was far better to have the one that represented 800 million people rather than the one that represented 13 million.

Mr. WOLFF. But that is in conflict with the rules of the United Nations.

Now, if we were going to take people and put them outside of the aegis of the United Nations which is similar to what happened to South Africa—and I don't hold any belief for the political ideas, the apartheid policies of South Africa, but I find that the exclusion of any nation from the U.N. or attached to the United Nations is basically against the purposes of those organizations.

Mr. Yost. Well, I would agree with you, but of course the Chinese situation is peculiar in that the two Governments each claim to be representing China as a whole.

Mr. WOLFF. That is true of North and South Korea; that is true of North and South Vietnam.

Mr. BINGHAM. No, it is not.

Mr. Yost. If the Nationalist Chinese claimed to be a separate country, then the situation might have been different, but they too claim that they are a part of China.

Mr. WOLFF. I would like to get to one or two other points here. You did talk about the question of bilateral agreements being secondary really to trying a multilateral approach.

I wonder what success the United Nations has had with the question of Turkey and narcotics abuse and the question of the growing of opium?

Mr. Yost. I am not sure that anybody has had much success with that. We, in the United States, had a temporary success and then it backfired which I think rather emphasizes the dangers of the bilateral approach.

Mr. WOLFF. But there was no real effort by the U.N. then?

Mr. YOST. It ended by damaging our relations with Turkey rather seriously.

Mr. WOLFF. But was there any effort by the United Nations? By UNESCO, as part of its charter, the Agency of Drug Abuse Control, did UNESCO take any role in attempting to influence the situation in Turkey?

Mrs. GINN. No. Our interest was in the educational area and the concern of the young people who were abroad who had problems and how we could help in that kind of a situation.

Mr. YOST. The United Nations does have a narcotics program. I am not familiar with just what they did vis-a-vis the Turkish opium program. I am sure they were concerned with it and just what kind of measures they took, frankly I don't know. But I think often there is much to be said for handling a highly controversial and sensitive problem by veiling it in a multilateral framework rather than trying to deal with it bilaterally.

Mr. WOLFF. As I understand, we have been trying to get the People's Republic of China interested in the problem. They are now a member of the United Nations and they have refused to participate. I understand that we have also been trying to get the Soviet Union involved in the whole question of international narcotics control and they have not joined the effort.

So that the fact is that maybe sometimes these multilateral efforts, even with those countries who are very vitally concerned—there has been a great amount of talk that the People's Republic of China have participated in an international traffic, and yet no one has ever been able to prove that they have participated in the traffic—but it would seem that if any nation wants to be part of the community of nations that they would participate in the solution of worldwide problems, and international narcotics control is one of them.

One further element. The Human Rights Commission. The Human Rights Commission has been quite active in a variety of areas. Are any of you familiar with any efforts of the Human Rights Commission so far as Northern Ireland is concerned?

[No response.]

Mr. WOLFF. Well, it seems to me I have just mentioned three or four problems here that are situations—

Mr. FRASER. If the gentleman will yield, the subcommittee, I think, is making a recommendation for a study on Northern Ireland.

Mr. WOLFF. Well, I have not heard of it and that is why I asked the question.

Mr. YOST. I might say in general, Mr. Congressman, that we have tried very hard many times, among others when I was at the U.N., to strengthen the U.N. capability to deal with human rights problems, for example to get them to appoint a Commission of Human Rights who would have some investigatory powers. But we were unable to do so.

This is an extraordinarily sensitive issue because it is considered to affect domestic jurisdiction and national sovereignty and so on. How sensitive it is is shown by the U.S. failure to ratify a whole series of human rights conventions.

Mr. WOLFF. What I am leading to is the fact that there are many important questions that have not been addressed by the United Nations and, therefore, I feel that there is a very serious dereliction on the part of the U.N. and its organizations that I believe should be addressed in the question of human rights.

As I understand it when Amnesty International, which was accredited through the U.N. made a statement to the effect that there were some 60 nations that were engaged in acts of torture against their own citizens that the accreditation to the U.N. was dropped.

Now, it seems to me that that type of situation cannot go unnoticed. I for one strongly believe in the United Nations but I would like to see it strengthened and I would like to see it address itself to the problems that exist in today's world rather than just the selected issues to which it seems to be addressing itself that are perhaps important to some of the nations that are involved. On a worldwide situation what can be more basic to the problems of the entire world than the question of human rights?

Mr. YOST. I agree with you entirely, Congressman. I feel very strongly on that subject. But I do think we have to recognize that, just because people do feel so strongly that it is a matter within their domestic jurisdiction, they are reluctant to have outsiders get involved in it. We are as intransigent as anybody else.

Mr. WOLFF. Let's get to one other point you alluded to, to the fact we are unhappy because the United Nations does not accept our positions.

Well, if you take something that goes far beyond our position, the question of international terrorism, skyjacking, and the like, here is a point where the United Nations have failed to take any position at all. This affects the world community. It doesn't affect an individual nation or individual state?

I feel again that here there has been a dereliction on the part of the United Nations and until such time as the United Nations directs its attention to these very pressing problems I am changing my position vis-a-vis the United Nations. Unless there are reforms initiated, I question how strong our support should be. There is even talk in some quarters of withdrawal from the General Assembly, but keeping our seat in the Security Council.

Whether or not this is the answer, no one can say. The important element to my mind is that we do stay within the United Nations because we can probably exercise much more in the way of strength if we are within that body than if we are without it.

Mr. YOST. I surely agree, Mr. Congressman. I think Mrs. Ginn made that point very well. We can't improve the U.N. if we are not there, and we need to improve it. We need to be there and work in all its programs. We know it is an organization with limited capabilities. It is far from being as strong as I would like to see it.

I hope that it can be strengthened gradually if we and others provide the leadership and resources.

Mr. LEONARD. Could I, Mr. Chairman, make a point on one point that Mr. Wolff brought out? This question of human rights I certainly agree is one upon which a great deal more ought to be done through the U.N. than is. I think it is one in which there is now developing a

receptivity toward initiatives in this area. I think it is one that leadership has to be given on.

Actions on this area will not arise spontaneously out of the normal procedures of the United Nations. It has to be given leadership, preferably by an important country such as the United States, and I was very pleased last fall when I saw in the Secretary of State's address to the U.N. that we were going to take an initiative in the field of torture, which is one of the real blots on humanity today. But to the best of my knowledge this initiative has not yet come forward.

I think within this area of human rights this subcommittee has in fact done very laudable work and I would hope that this would be followed up and that this subcommittee would work with the Executive and try to develop ways in which the United States can take initiatives in the United Nations of a character that has a chance of having some success, in a generally improved atmosphere, generally improved receptivity toward this whole question and in this fashion change the deplorable situation.

Mr. FRASER. I might say, Mr. Leonard, we have some hope that the U.S. position at the meeting of the Commission in Geneva is going to be stronger than it has been in the past. We will find out soon.

Mr. Bingham.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

On this matter of human rights, I agree with what you gentlemen have said about the importance of strengthening the United Nations' role in this field. But we should recognize that one reason that the U.N. has not gone faster, farther is because we would have been very upset if the U.N. had started to inquire into violations of human rights in the United States. Lord knows we have plenty of them.

I wanted to focus, if I might, on the UNESCO matter. I read your statement, Mrs. Ginn, with great interest and also the resolution of the U.S. National Commission to UNESCO which I must say I had not seen before and I am most interested in the strong language that was used in that resolution to deplore and condemn the actions that were taken at the UNESCO General Conference.

I was also interested to see that Ambassador Leonard in his statement characterizes those actions as clearly unwise and designed to punish Israel, so I don't think we are in any disagreement about the character of those actions—that they were politically motivated, and that they were most unwise and deplorable.

The only disagreement I suppose between us is as to what should be done about it. I notice that also in the National Commission's resolution you urged the U.S. Government to exert every effort to nullify the deleterious effects of the resolution by, among other things, seeking Israel's immediate admission as a member of the European group and restoration of all UNESCO assistance to Israel.

I might say if that were done and UNESCO took that position, I have no doubt that that would put an end to the cutoff of funds that was voted by the Congress last year. The wording of that paragraph, by the way is:

A cutoff of funds until the President certifies to the Congress that such organization, one, has adopted policies which are fully consistent with its educational, scientific, and cultural objectives and, two, has taken concrete steps to correct its recent actions of a primary political character.

We have not asked for anything different than the National Commission is asking for. So it really comes down to the question of whether corrective action will be taken by measures short of the extreme sanction of a cutoff of funds.

I think that is where our difference lies. I am delighted to see that the National Commission has gone as far as it has.

The question here, I think, has been somewhat off the mark because there was a suggestion that you were not critical of what UNESCO had done and you are critical.

Mrs. GINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BINGHAM. So it is just a matter of what is the best way to cope with it, and my question I suppose would be this: In view of the kind of drastic action which the Congress has taken, what reason would you have to suppose that the UNESCO Conference would act more wisely in the future given the fact that most of the members are anti-Israel.

Mrs. GINN. Well, I would call to your attention in the statement of Israel by the new Director General in which he says—and I will read to you what he said so you will know what the new leadership of UNESCO believes about it.

For my own part, as I had occasion to say at the 18th session of the General Conference, I think that in an organization devoted to education, science and culture, we must avoid those conflicts which take on the character of systematic confrontations. We should perhaps also avoid the adoption of resolutions, even with large majorities, that could result in deep bitterness in certain quarters. The Golden Rule for an association such as UNESCO should always be the search for a consensus through patient and open dialogue.

This, sir, represents the new leadership of UNESCO and a gentleman with a philosophy of this kind, I feel, sure will make every effort to see that such does not occur.

Mr. BINGHAM. Well, I applaud that statement, too, and I think it is fine, but that is not the statement of the General Conference.

Mrs. GINN. This is true, but this is the statement of the gentleman who has assumed leadership at the close of this General Conference and whose leadership and activity of course cannot really be reflected until the next General Conference which will occur in 1976.

Mr. BINGHAM. Well, if his influence can be put in that direction effectively then I think actions will be taken that would make it possible for the President to certify that the necessary conditions have been met, and funding of UNESCO could continue.

Mrs. GINN. May I suggest, though, that in the interim that the United States has lost its opportunity to offer the positive strong leadership which Congressman Wolff has so ably suggested and for which he has given us such good ideas; and we have lost the opportunity to continue our bilateral contracts. We have lost the residue of good will because we have failed in our legal obligations in UNESCO in failing to pay our assessment; and it simply lets the United States stand in a position of no leadership at all, which is the one thing which I believe we have all agreed that we should not do unless we are carrying our share of the load.

Unless we are working to restore this and change the situation, why, it just takes us that much longer to achieve the goals which you and I both want.

MR. BINGHAM. You say these resolutions directed at Israel have been going on for some time. I presume the United States has been doing what it could in a quiet way to correct the situation but those efforts were not successful; were they?

MRS. GINN. Apparently not.

MR. BINGHAM. Ambassador Leonard?

MR. LEONARD. Mr. Bingham, it seems to me that this problem of UNESCO ought to be looked at in the larger context, the whole problem of moving toward peace in the Middle East; and that the unwise action that was taken arises out of the sense of frustration because of the feeling that adequate progress is not being made. If progress can begin to be made or resumed toward peace in the Middle East, which we all pray to God for a lot of reasons of a very much weightier character than even those involved in the UNESCO operation, then I think this sense of frustration will be in a considerable degree dealt with and the kind of problem encountered repeatedly here is much less likely to come up.

MR. BINGHAM. I certainly agree with that. More broadly, I think this problem in the Middle East is the cause of most of the criticism that attaches to the United Nations itself today. There is so much bitterness and a total lack of balance in the approach toward Israel. A great majority of the members of the U.N. are either actively or passively anti-Israel today.

Once that problem can be solved I think a great many of the other problems that have been plaguing the United Nations will also be solved. But I don't believe that we can wait on that eventuality, happy as it would be, to try to do something about the UNESCO matter which does seem to be in a peculiar category. There, the organization, I think, by the agreement of most observers has gotten out of its sphere.

The U.N. is a political organization; UNESCO is not supposed to be. The feeling I think in the Congress was that unless strong action were taken to register the fact the United States simply won't stand for this type of political action, that there would be no improvement. Now, that is a matter of judgment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. FRASER. I don't know exactly what case it is, but yesterday one of the witnesses, I believe Dr. Evans, indicated that there is some general rule that excavations of the kind going on in Jerusalem are apparently prohibited under some international conventions.

Did that factor come up?

MRS. GINN. Isn't there a Hague convention that places the responsibility on the United Nations for guarding against changes in land as a result of war, and I believe UNESCO is the Secretariat that is responsible for that, and it was under that kind of an area that they moved into this discussion in the first place.

There is a convention and I cannot give you the exact wording for it.

MR. FRASER. We probably ought to get the convention for the record and put it in. Obviously it is a part of the keys.

MR. WOLFF.

MR. WOLFF. That poses another question, the question of lands taken by war.

Has UNESCO taken a position against any of the Soviet lands that are occupied and the change of some of those lands that have been occupied by war?

Mrs. GINN. That, sir, I am not competent to answer.

Mr. WOLFF. I take it there are certain changes that have taken place there, too, as I understand it, as well as in the question of some activities that have been taken by Turkey with relationship to minority Armenian groups here.

But the other point I would like to bring up is I don't share the belief of my colleague who said that the primary problem that we do find is dissatisfaction with the United Nations solely because of the Middle East. I think there are other areas that certainly are in contest now and the Middle East is one that has been brought to the fore.

But since the point was made, are you familiar with some type of educational material of the U.N. that was circulated in some of the Arab lands of recent years?

Mrs. GINN. No.

Mr. WOLFF. I would suggest that on that basis—and I am not trying to put you in an adversary position—but I think it would be wise to examine some of the type of literature that had been sponsored by UNESCO that was circulated throughout the Arab lands exacerbating the problems of the Middle East.

Mr. BINGHAM. Would the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. WOLFF. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. I heard Dr. Evans speak about this just the other day. As I understand it, the material the gentleman refers to was material used in the schools by the Arab governments who control the schools and the issue was whether UNESCO should continue to assist in those schools in spite of that material being circulated.

So far as I know, the material was not supplied by UNESCO.

Mr. WOLFF. It was funded by it.

Mr. BINGHAM. No, I don't believe it was funded by it. The issue was whether UNESCO should continue to assist in the educational programs of those schools even though that type of literature—and that is a debatable question—but I don't think UNESCO was funding or supplying the literature.

Mr. WOLFF. Well, I have seen material that was circulated with the UNESCO stamp upon it that was kind of scurrilous material and I think—I hate to differ with my colleague again—

Mr. BINGHAM. I would be glad to see it, but that is not my understanding.

Mr. WOLFF. There is a question as to some of the literature that was circulated under the aegis of the United Nations. Whether it is printed by them or not, I don't know.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FRASER. Just one other question in relation to the exclusion of Israel from the European group.

I understand that the United States and Canada had applied to be in a region group and were—

Mrs. GINN. To my knowledge, not really applied, but had expressed an interest in being part of, and their interest was not acknowledged and they were not accepted for almost 10 years.

Mr. FRASER. But this last conference they were.

Mrs. GINN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, could I ask one further question about the UNESCO matter?

I am surprised that neither your statement nor the resolution refers to what I consider in some ways to be the most objectionable of the Conference resolutions with regard to Israel, which was one that directed the Director General to undertake the supervision of education in the occupied territories in Israel which was certainly a most unrealistic resolution, but neither your statement nor the declaration of the National Commission referred to that.

Mrs. GINN. Well, that probably is a part of the analysis that was given to this resolution by the Director General who shared your concern that it was unrealistic and very difficult to be carried out.

So, I don't think that he nor the rest of us have had a feeling that there would be much of any kind of an implementation possible.

Mr. BINGHAM. Thank you.

Mr. FRASER. Well, I want to express my appreciation to the panel. I must say I get the general impression that the United States is applying considerably higher standards in judgment in both UNESCO and the General Assembly than it has applied to its own actions over the past years.

I think this arises out of the fact that many of us identified with the plight that Israel faces, with the threats to her security, but in terms of the international organizations involved it isn't clear to me that we are applying standards that have been consistently applied through the years.

I don't think that is for myself a basis to suggest that the intrusion of political considerations is a wise thing, but only that we ought ourselves to begin to adhere to higher standards consistently rather than intermittently which is something I hope we do, not only on these kinds of issues, but on the human rights issue generally.

Thank you very much.

This has been very helpful to us and we very much appreciate all your time.

[Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF HON. PHILIP M. CRANE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the opportunity to express my views with regard to the United Nations and the U.S. role in support of that organization. In view of recent developments these hearings are certainly timely and, as a result of them, it is my hope that Americans will get a clearer view of what we can expect from the U.N. and what we can, or should, contribute to it.

When the United Nations was originated in 1945, it was thought to be the hope for future world peace. For Americans this was particularly true—due in part to the desire to avoid another world war and in part to guilt feelings over our failure to join the League of Nations. Regardless of the lessons of history, America, more than any other nation, wanted the U.N. to succeed. President Roosevelt, in a manner reminiscent of Woodrow Wilson, made all types of concessions to see that it did get started and each succeeding administration has given the U.N. extensive political and financial support.

To be very blunt, without United States support, the U.N. would have collapsed, or would have been proven useless long, long ago. American dollars—over 5.1 billion of them since 1945—have kept the organization going financially and American prestige has given the organization what little leverage and respectability it has enjoyed to date.

Unfortunately, recent events have demonstrated that a majority of U.N. members do not seem to care about such things as respectability, responsibility or reasonable adherence to the U.N. charter, to say nothing of the feelings of the nation that has been the organization's political and financial angel.

There can be no justification, on the basis of the charter or otherwise, for granting the Palestine Liberation Organization observer status at the U.N. General Assembly.

There is no consistent rationale, after the admittance of Red China to the U.N. on the basis of "universality" (even though this meant kicking Nationalist China out of the U.N., in direct violation of the U.N. charter), for suspending South Africa's membership in the general assembly.

There is no logic in eliminating Israel from the European UNESCO program while granting the Viet Cong office space so as to improve their liaison with two humanitarian agencies of the United Nations. And there is no justice in countenancing the expropriation, without compensation, of foreign owned property by any nation.

The fact that these steps have been taken only proves what some of us have been saying for a long time. It is now painfully apparent that many member nations are more interested in playing politics than promoting peace and that, as a promoter of peace, the U.N. has been increasingly ineffectual.

That this is the case should not be any surprise. The league of nations had a similar problem, one that U.S. membership in the League of Nations would not have corrected. The league did nothing, at times when action was imperative, because member nations put their own parochial interests before anything else—including the league charter. Now, U.N. member nations are doing the same thing; they are acting in behalf of their own vested interests, at the expense of both the U.N. charter and the higher ideals upon which it was based.

For example, terrorism can contribute nothing to the cause of world peace, yet the U.N. majority is condoning it because that majority is either part of, or in sympathy with, the Arab forces that wish to extinguish Israel as a nation.

Likewise, aggression is alien to the stated goals of the U.N. but, since the Korean War when aggression was halted but not defeated, no effort has been made by the U.N. to curb aggression when it has occurred. When Russian armies moved into Hungary in 1956, nothing was done. When Indian armies moved into Goa in 1961, nothing was done. When North Vietnamese forces moved into South Vietnam nothing was done. When Russian tanks rolled into Czechoslovakia in 1968, nothing was done. And when Egypt and Syria attacked Israel in the midst of Yom Kippur in 1973, nothing was done.

True, there have been U.N. peacekeeping forces in the Congo (which the Soviet Union refused to pay for) and in the Middle East. And there have been U.N. observers stationed elsewhere, but these forces have not kept the peace, through no fault of their own.

The fault lies with those nations, obviously a majority, which are quick to brand self-determination or self defense as aggression when practiced by free world nations while proclaiming the reverse is true when perpetrated by Communist or Third World nations.

And then we come to the issue of human rights. All member nations proclaim to be in favor of such rights, but when we get down to the nitty-gritty the same type of hypocrisy exists. Thus, we have the spectacle of an embargo being declared against Rhodesia and a suspension from membership in the General Assembly being applied to South Africa on the grounds that both governments are mistreating their people, while at the same time, absolutely nothing has been, or is being, done about Soviet concentration camps in Siberia, political repression in Red China, the 20,000 plus political prisoners in Cuba and the denial of basic freedoms in all the countries behind the iron curtain. What is happening to personal and political liberty in the Communist world is far more serious and potentially dangerous to the cause of world peace and freedom than what has happened in Rhodesia or South Africa, yet these two are singled out. Why? Because, a majority of U.N. nations are obviously more interested in what the Communists can offer them, or in the case of the Communists maintenance of their own totalitarian dictatorships. If all the member nations of the U.N. were subjected to the penalties to which some have been subjected, the U.N. would be a very small organization indeed.

Man is not perfect, nor is he likely to be in the foreseeable future. The same holds true for nations. Therefore, it is only reasonable to expect that men and nations will, at times, act irrationally; that they are likely to put their own selfish interests before anything else; and, that they are not likely to subject themselves voluntarily to the disagreeable dictates of others. As a consequence, it is unreasonable to expect them to support a world organization unless it enhances their national objectives. Nor is it likely that they would be willing to surrender their sovereignty to such an organization.

Such being the case, the time has come to recognize that the U.N. is not, nor will it ever be, the panacea that some hoped for. The record shows that the organization is not only incapable of achieving the goals set forth in its charter, but is in complete disagreement over the definition of those goals and how they should be applied. In fact, the United Nations is a myth, because the institution is neither united nor comprised of nations. There is no consensus on basic values. In the case of totalitarian dictatorships, no reasonable man would attempt to suggest that such a nation enjoys representation. All that is represented in such states is the handful of gangsters who retain control through force and terrorism. So, what good is the U.N.? At best it may serve a useful purpose as a forum where governments can let off steam, where petty disputes can be discussed and negotiated, and where impoverished Nations can have contacts that would be denied them if they had to rely on embassies throughout the world. It represents the de facto and de jure governments of the world and gives them a place to make themselves heard.

For these reasons, it seems to me that each nation should contribute to its operation to the extent that it represents the people of the world. Thus, rather than footing over 30% of the bill as it has in the past, the United States should pay 5.6% of the bill because it has only 5.6% of the total population of the nations represented in the U.N. Furthermore, nations refusing to pay their share of the bill, should be suspended from membership in the U.N. until such time as they settle their back accounts.

To those who think such a position might seem harsh, let me cite a few figures. I mentioned, earlier, that the U.S. has contributed over \$5.1 billion to the U.N. since its inception. The Soviet contribution over the same period has totalled only \$519 million. Furthermore, the U.S. has always paid its U.N. bill on time or in advance. The Soviet Union by contrast is almost \$110 million in arrears. Moreover, the U.S. is assessed the largest share of the U.N. regular budget (25%) while the Soviet, which has the second highest assessment, is charged only 12.9%. Finally, I should note that, when the U.N. gets in financial trouble, it is to the U.S. not the Soviet Union, that the U.N. turns for help.

The reason I draw this comparison with the Soviet Union is because the Soviets are a major world power with more people than we have (about 50 million more), to say nothing of the fact that they have three votes to our one in the U.N. General Assembly and have the same veto power in the security council that we enjoy. Even when the Soviet Union was not getting its way in the U.N.—which was a long time ago—it never had to support the organization to the extent the U.S. has and, in fact, it refused to pay much of what it was asked to pay.

If anything, a 5.6% contribution from the U.S. is generous; after all we have done for the U.N., its member nations ought to allow us a free membership for a good while to come.

Of course, no such thing will happen. Instead, the U.N. in recent years has been voting in such a way as deliberately to antagonize millions of Americans. For example, I need cite only the seating of Red China, the expulsion of Nationalist China, the suspension of South Africa, the sanctions against Rhodesia, the granting of observer status to the PLO, the dropping of Israel from the European UNESCO program and the approval of expropriation, without compensation, of foreign-owned companies (most of which are going to be U.S. companies). In addition, there is the list of things that could have been done: Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and South Vietnam just to name a few. I could go on, but rather than repeat the obvious, let me just suggest that the future portends more of the same.

In view of the total lack of concern by the U.N. for its charter and for the viewpoint of the nation that has done more than any other to try to put the ideals of the charter into practice, I am about to introduce a bill into the House of Representatives that would reduce the total U.S. contribution to the U.N. to a percentage equal to the percentage of the U.S. population as compared to the total population of all member nations. This would (1) reduce the U.S. share to 5.6% starting in 1976, (2) save the American taxpayers at least \$340 million and (3) establish the population representation standard that I referred to earlier. Moreover, such a standard would do justice to all nations while recognizing the fact that the U.N. has its limitations and that the U.S. has both recognized and accepted that fact.

Perhaps, when other nations begin having to carry their fair share of the financial load, they will be more inclined to work together for the benefit of all rather than at cross-purposes to the benefit of only themselves. Should such a change in attitude develop, history would record that the biggest contribution the U.S. made to the U.N. politically was the reduction of its contribution to the U.N. financially. For the sake of all, I hope things work out just that way.

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH CONGRESS ON THE 1974 GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND THE U.S. POSITION IN THE UNITED NATIONS

The American Jewish Congress welcomes this opportunity to submit its views on the recently-concluded session of the United Nations General Assembly and on the relationship of the United States to that international organization. From its inception in 1918, the American Jewish Congress has been dedicated to the preservation and extension of democratic freedoms around the world. Because of our commitment to a just world order, the American Jewish Congress has been an active participant in non-governmental organizations supportive of the United Nations.

While the record of the United Nations in promoting the peaceful solution of international disputes has not always been entirely admirable, there have been many instances since its creation in which the U.N. has contributed to world order. Even during the last session, the U.N. served a useful function, in accordance with the historic purpose underlying its Charter, by stationing peacekeeping forces in Cyprus and renewing the UNDOF force in the Middle East. These are only two of a host of actions that brought credit to the institution this year.

There have been other recent actions by the U.N., however, which can hardly be viewed as consistent with the purported goals of that organizations. We refer, first, to the actions of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) at its plenary session in November, 1974, when it adopted a series of anti-Israel resolutions which have no conceivably legitimate justification. Abandoning any concern with education, science, or culture and succumbing to the oil blackmail of Arab states, the General Conference of UNESCO voted to withhold assistance to Israel and bar her from membership in its European regional grouping because Israel had allegedly imperiled monumental and historical sites in Jerusalem. Another resolution, which was characterized as "crude and inoperative" by one of the witnesses before the Subcommittee on International Organizations, condemns Israel's educational and cultural activities in the occupied territories. Consequently, as a result of a vindictive political reprisal directed by the Arab states, Israel is now the only member of UNESCO to belong to no regional grouping, with no right to participate in regional activities.

These actions were accompanied by factual allegations which contradict the reports of UNESCO's own Director-General, whose representatives visited Jerusalem many times in the past several years. For example, the Director-General's latest report, based on visits to Jerusalem in December, 1973 and April, 1974 by Professor Raymond Lemaire of the Roman Catholic University of Louvain, reaffirmed the conclusion of prior studies that Israeli authorities have consistently and painstakingly cared for all religious and historical sites there. Referring to the archaeological excavations at the foot of the Temple Mount, the report stated:

The excavations are being carried out by a perfectly well-qualified team of experts of various kinds, who are extremely attentive to all aspects and to all the periods of which remains have been found on the site. The same care is expended on the preservation of remains of the Omayyad palaces as on those of the Herodian period.

The report further stated that the excavations in the Old City's Jewish Quarter were being

carried out with the utmost care and employing the most expert methods. These excavations have already led to discoveries of the utmost importance in relation to the history of Jerusalem.

The observations of the National Coalition of American Nuns are to the same effect: "Israel has rebuilt Jerusalem, pouring into it millions of dollars and more especially untold human resources. Jerusalem is now available to all faiths and never before have the holy places been so protected and maintained."

Ironically, one of the chief sponsors of UNESCO's condemnatory resolutions was Jordan, a country which, during its occupation of Jerusalem from 1948 to 1967, destroyed over thirty synagogues (including the Hurva synagogue, built in 1267) and used the headstones of ancient Jewish cemeteries for paving blocks. Then, UNESCO was silent. Now, after Israel has restored holy places and opened them to all worshippers, UNESCO manifests an exquisite concern for the archaeological character of the city.

Some have argued that the scrupulous care the Israelis have taken to safeguard the religious monuments of the Old City is not the issue at all. They claim instead that the *fact* of Israeli archaeological excavations, not their methodologic expertise, constitutes a violation of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. It is our understanding, however, that while the Hague Convention protects archaeological excavations it does not prohibit them. The signatories to the Convention, including Israel, realized that independently-supervised digs are of vital significance in the preservation of cultural treasures.

That the UNESCO resolutions were acts of naked political reprisal is further evident from the manner in which Arab delegates ensured that other conference representatives would not be swayed by the actual merits of the case. Using political and economic intimidation to gain support for their resolutions, the Arabs prevented any possibility that, prior to the voting, the views of other delegates—or even the Director-General—might be considered. Indeed, delegates were not permitted to study the Director-General's report at any time during the deliberations.

Another series of U.N. actions evincing a similar disregard for basic principles of fairness were the invitation to Yasir Arafat to address the General Assembly on the question of Palestine, the granting of observer status to the Palestine Liberation Organization, and the ominously ambiguous resolution that "recognizes the right of the Palestinian people to regain its rights *by all means* in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations." Among the "rights" affirmed by the resolution is "the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property from which they have been displaced and uprooted. . . ." Particularly since the resolution on Palestinian rights is mute on the question of Israel's right to exist, we believe that it encourages the interpretation that international body approves of the displacement of a member nation, Israel, by a new, PLO-dominated state.

Never before has the U.N. granted such status to people who represent neither a member state nor any state at all. Significantly, the U.N. Charter requires that non-members who wish to speak on international disputes must be, by definition, "states" and grants the right of debate only when those states "accept in advance, for the purposes of the dispute, the obligations of *peaceful* settlement provided in the present charter" (Article 35, Sec. 2).

In no way does the PLO meet the test of the Charter. First, it is not a state at all. Secondly, its avowed aim is "to repulse the Zionist, imperialist invasion . . . and to purge the Zionist presence from Palestine," (Article 15, The Palestine National Covenant). Finally, the method of the PLO, as the world has too often witnessed, is barbaric terrorism directed at innocent civilians—Olympic athletes at Munich, American diplomats in Khartoum, and Israeli children at Ma'alot. The U.N., of course, has failed to condemn the PLO for these killings. Apparently, the PLO is a state for the purpose of granting it observer status at the U.N., but it is not a state for the purpose of condemning savage acts of terror.

The resolutions of the General Assembly in favor of the PLO leave in doubt whether Israel, a member state of the U.N., has a right to exist. By abrogating Security Council Resolution 242 as the basis for peace negotiations in the Middle East (a step consistent with the program of the PLO), the General Assembly, it is feared, bestowed international blessings on the right of the PLO to use any form of violence to force Israel to yield her sovereignty. During the debates preceding these resolutions, moreover, Israel was the victim of procedural inequities even more appalling than the obstruction of free discussion that preceded the UNESCO resolutions. In an unprecedented action, one that made a mockery of the U.N. as a forum for the exchange of ideas, the General Assembly limited Israel's right of reply to one speech and a ten-minute rebuttal at the end of the day.

It is tempting, but mistaken, to minimize the destructive impact of these events by concluding that U.N. resolutions simply mirror world opinion and do not in-

fluence the behavior of states or other groups. The resolutions of the General Assembly on Palestine and of UNESCO on Jerusalem are indeed harmful to peace in the Mideast. Not only do they appear to reward terrorism, but they polarize the positions of the opposing parties—as to Israel, by intensifying her feelings of international isolation and her understandable distrust for the ultimate goals of Arab states; as to the Arabs, by committing their national honor to extreme solutions formally endorsed by the world community. As a result, the flexibility of leaders on both sides is substantially reduced. The situation is further aggravated because many member states which might otherwise be neutral on Mideast issues are forced, by the railroading through of one-sided resolutions, to commit themselves to radical positions.

The United States should reject the view that we, in earlier decades, used the United Nations in a fashion similar to that which we protest today. While a majority of nations generally sided with us on international issues in the past, that majority never sought to pass one-sided, unsupportable resolutions. The recent U.N. actions discussed above are unique in the history of that body inasmuch as they demonstrate, on the part of the new majority and particularly the Arab states exercising their newly-discovered oil power, a total abandonment of legal, moral and even political constraints.

Perhaps it should not be surprising that Arab, Communist and assorted Third World countries—many of them governed by oppressive totalitarian regimes—should show so little regard for precedential fairness and equal treatment under the law, principles which the United States has always assumed to be fundamental. But the fact that a U.N. majority has unabashedly chosen to discard these principles for the sake of discriminatory political attacks against Israel suggests that it might be appropriate for the United States itself to apply political and economic pressures, evidently the only pressures to which some countries will respond, in an attempt to inspire among member states a closer conformity to the spirit of the U.N. Charter.

The American Jewish Congress, therefore, supports the effort of the United States Congress to withhold funds from UNESCO until it rescinds the politically-motivated resolutions passed at its Paris conference.¹ Further, the United States should urge the newly-rich oil producing states of the Middle East to increase their voluntary contributions to the U.N. as a gesture of good faith—particularly to agencies like UNRWA which support their fellow Arabs—without waiting for next year's scheduled reformulation of U.N. contributions.

The recent adoption of a series of one-sided, unfair, and unworkable resolutions has compromised the noble ideals of the U.N. and impaired its peace-keeping potential. We believe that these resolutions derive from fundamental imperfections in the underlying structures and procedures of the U.N., imperfections that demand searching reexamination if future transactions at the U.N. are to be materially and permanently improved.

We recognize, however, that this reconsideration cannot be done in haste out of partisan motives. We recognize, too, that it necessarily entails the best thinking of all those concerned to restore the U.N. as a forum which is not only credible but genuinely reflective of the yearning for peace on the part of all the peoples of the world—and we recognize that this undoubtedly will require an extended effort. In the interim, therefore, we urge that the member states be encouraged, out of their own sense of justice, to return to established notions of fairness and universality. That minimum change, at least, is imperative if the U.N. is to make a significant contribution to world peace.

¹ At the December 10, 1974 meeting of its Executive Committee, the American Jewish Congress adopted the following statement:

UNESCO's recent restrictions, in effect expelling Israel from membership, represent an abandonment of its mandate to promote scientific, cultural and educational goals and have transformed UNESCO into a crude political instrumentality.

These activities have been universally denounced. Scientists, artists and intellectuals have rightly severed all association with UNESCO and its projects. The Senate of the United States and the parliaments of other nations have either reduced or have moved to discontinue all subventions of future UNESCO activities.

We believe these acts of practical protest are a necessary and effective reply to UNESCO's demonstration of moral delinquency.

STATEMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMISSION TO STUDY THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE

As the year 1975 begins, the American Government and the American people are expressing serious concern about developments in the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). To lend support to these agencies—and, indeed, to the entire United Nations system—we desire to explain the causes for this erosion of confidence. In urging patience and understanding, we appeal for renewed leadership on the part of the Executive Branch and the Congress and for continued support by other non-governmental organizations, the media, and the public.

The Commission to Study the Organization of Peace was founded in 1939, as World War II was enveloping Europe. For the past 35 years, the Commission had endeavored to provide new and constructive ideas about building a peaceful world community. Its Executive Committee hopes that this Statement, reaffirming fidelity to the principles upon which the United Nations system was founded, will contribute to restoring American confidence and support.

EROSION OF CONFIDENCE

Within the past three months, a series of events occurred within the United Nations system that caused widespread resentment, even anger, in the American Congress, the media, and the public. These events struck unexpectedly and suddenly—like, in the words of one observer, “a series of thunderstorms in the night.” One or two of these events would have caused concern, but not dismay; it was the rapid sequence of them that caused even some of the strongest supporters of the United Nations in this country to question their long-time loyalties.

1. Eight of the ten non-permanent members of the Security Council and two permanent members, China and the Soviet Union, voted to expel South Africa from the United Nations. On the first proposal for expulsion of a Member in 29 years, the other three permanent members—United States, United Kingdom, and France—cast the first triple veto.

2. The President of the General Assembly, Abdelaziz Bouteflika of Algeria, ruled that South Africa could not participate in the current session. No delegation asked the Secretary-General for a legal opinion on this matter, and the President's ruling was upheld by a vote of 91 in favor, 22 against (including the United States), with 19 abstentions.

3. The General Assembly invited the Palestine Liberation Organization, as “the representative of the Palestine people” to participate in the plenary meetings relating to Palestine. The vote was 105 in favor, 4 against (including the United States), with 20 abstentions. The leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, Yasir Arafat, was accorded the dignity of a Chief of State when he addressed a plenary meeting.

4. The General Assembly subsequently recognized “the inalienable right of the Palestinians to return to their homes and property”, without referring to Israel at all, and acknowledged their right to participate as a “principal party” in a peace settlement. The vote was 89 in favor, 8 against (including the United States), with 37 abstentions.

5. The General Assembly also invited the Palestine Liberation Organization—by a vote of 95 in favor, 17 against (including the United States), with 19 abstentions—to participate as an observer in the work of the General Assembly and of other international conferences.

6. During the plenary debate on the Palestine question, the President of the General Assembly ruled that each delegation could speak only once. This limitation on Israel gave an obvious advantage to the 17 Arab delegations and their many supporters. When challenged by Israel and the United States, the President's ruling was upheld by a vote of 75 in favor, 23 against (including the United States), with 18 abstentions.

7. The General Assembly adopted a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, highly favorable to the developing countries, which included *inter alia* the right of each State to "nationalize, expropriate, or transfer ownership of foreign property", with compensation paid in accordance with its "relevant laws and regulations" but without any reference to international law. The vote was 120 in favor, 6 against (including the United States), with 10 abstentions.

8. The General Conference of UNESCO adopted three highly controversial resolutions, all rather technical in character, that were unfavorable to Israel. The first—by a vote of 59 in favor, 34 against (including the United States), with 24 abstentions—withholds assistance to Israel, which amounted to only \$24,000 in 1973-74, until it ceases certain archeological excavations in the occupied portions of the city of Jerusalem. The second—by a vote of 51 in favor, 5 against (including the United States), with 22 abstentions—noted "with anxiety" that the populations in the occupied territories were not enjoying their rights to national education and cultural life. The third—by a vote of 33 in favor (including the United States), 48 against, with 31 abstentions—rejected Israel's request to participate in the European regional grouping for future activities. The General Conference had previously granted the United States and Canada, also non-European countries, an exception to participate in this grouping. None of these resolutions affected Israel's membership in UNESCO or its right to attend regional meetings.

As a result of this sequence of events, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador John Scali, delivered on December 6 a carefully considered and cautiously worded criticism of the United Nations General Assembly and the UNESCO General Conference. Without mentioning either South Africa or Israel, Ambassador Scali strongly warned against the "tyranny of the majority" that was pushing through "unenforceable, onesided" resolutions unfavorable to the minority of developed countries, warned that these actions were endangering support of the United Nations system in the American Congress and public and in other developed countries upon whose support the United Nations depends, and appealed to the developing countries to exercise their votes with a greater sense of responsibility and realism. Similar views were expressed by the representatives of the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, and the Netherlands. These critical remarks elicited replies from a considerable number of representatives of the developing countries.

CAUSES OF THE CRISIS

The recent quarrels and confrontations in the United Nations and in UNESCO have resulted from several different but closely related causes.

The major political controversies have shifted, in the past decade, from an East-West to a North-South axis. The ideological differences between the Free World and the Communist world remain, to be sure; and the rivalries in the Mediterranean, the Middle East, and Indian Ocean, and the political and economic competition for influence in the Third World continue. However, both sides recognize the catastrophe that a war would bring. In the present spirit of détente, the two superpowers recognize that neither can impose its will on the other; hence both must maintain the peace, even while engaged in acrimonious debates and divisive confrontation involving the Third World.

Today, the controversy over political, economic, and social issues rages between most of the over 30 developed countries—North America, Western Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, and the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe—and some 100 developing countries—in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. The developing countries range from the newly rich oil producers, whose rapidly expanding wealth adds for the first time some economic strength to the group, to the smallest and poorest areas in the world. They consider that the present division between have's and have-not's is the result of historical injustices, and they are determined to redress the imbalance. Communist China and the Soviet Union, each for its own purposes, exploit the differences between the developed and the developing countries. The United States and other major powers are also involved in these rivalries. On every major issue of 1975—such as population, food, energy, environment, development, investment, trade, and to some extent human rights—the developed and the developing countries are diametrically opposed.

The division between the developed and the developing countries is exasperated by two special problems: first, racial discrimination in South Africa and Rho-

desia, and South Africa's administration of South-West Africa (Namibia); and, second, the conflict between Israel and its Arab neighbors. With regard to southern Africa, most of the developed countries favor patience, pressure, and continuing private and public dialogue; while most of the developing countries, supported by the Soviet Union, favor ostracism, economic sanctions, and even military action. With regard to Israel, the developing countries, again supported by the Soviet Union, take an increasingly intransigent position. They have succeeded in virtually isolating the United States, as a supporter of Israel. While the developed countries remain concerned over violations of individual rights, the developing countries have become obsessed with violations of group rights in several areas.

During the cold-war political confrontation between the East and West, the United States had a relatively easy time in every international forum. Of the original 51 members of the United Nations in 1945, at least 35 were closely associated with the United States, only 5 with the Soviet Union, and only 10 were non-aligned. For those first 15 years, the United States enjoyed control of the General Assembly and other international forums, at least on all cold-war issues. With a little arm-twisting, the U.S. Delegation could easily collect a majority vote, or even a two-thirds vote when required.

The United States did not hesitate in those years to use its "automatic majority" in its own national interests. Ambassador Scali would have done well to concede, in his comments on "the pursuit of mathematical majorities", that the United States was once able to keep Communist China, through election of favorable credentials committees and through parliamentary maneuvers, out of every international organization; to persuade the United Nations to intervene in Korea; to shift peacekeeping from the Security Council, in case of a veto, to the General Assembly under the "Uniting for Peace" Resolution of 1950; to keep disputes between the United States and Latin American countries out of the United Nations; and to condemn the Communist countries repeatedly for violating international law and infringing of human rights.

Today the shoe is on the other foot. Because of the liquidation of the colonial empires, which the United States favored, and because of the failure of the United States and the other permanent members of the Security Council to block the admission of many newly independent mini-states, United Nations membership has increased to 138, with still more members to come. The more than 100 developing countries, usually backed by the 13 Communist countries, can easily garner a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly and the necessary majority in other forums. For example, of the 54 members of the United Nations Economic and Social Council, only 14 are developed countries, outnumbered by 33 developing countries (including China), and 7 Eastern European countries.

A TIME FOR PATIENCE

Some of the disappointment and dismay evoked in the Congress, the media, and the public can be assuaged by a little patience and understanding. The U.N. Security Council and General Assembly, after all, are political bodies. While the other organs of the United Nations, UNESCO, and the other Specialized Agencies deal with subjects like education, science, culture, labor, health, agriculture, communications, and transportation, the delegations to these bodies represent governments, which are politically motivated. The delegations in all those forums promote the interests of their respective governments, just as United States Senators and Representatives promote the interests of their respective constituencies. The functions and powers of an international assembly and a national legislature are entirely different; but some of the attitudes and activities of their members are strikingly similar.

In every debate, whether in a national or international forum, there are conflicting interests; and there are grounds for difference on the merits of both sides of every argument. It is the essence of statesmanship to reconcile these competing interests and differing points of view for the common good, through negotiation and compromise. Just as very few decisions of the American Congress satisfy all its members, very few decisions of the United Nations and other international organizations satisfy all their Member States.

The lesson of the current crisis, and it may prove to be useful, is this: The principal organs of the United Nations, UNESCO, and all other international organizations reflect the interests and objectives of politically motivated govern-

ments, and thus reflect the politics of the real world. In all of them, the United States will enjoy some successes and suffer some defeats. (As every politician everywhere knows, to use the vernacular, "You can't win 'em all.") Indeed, on two important issues in the current session of the General Assembly—Korea and Cambodia—the United States enjoyed successes, although by a margin of only 18 and 2 votes, respectively; and the Soviet Union, China, and their supporters suffered defeats.

Because the Congress makes a few mistakes, in the eyes of one or another group of citizens, these mistakes do not justify scrapping the Constitution. Because the United Nations General Assembly makes a few mistakes in the eyes of the United States, these mistakes do not justify scrapping the Charter. On the contrary, the wise citizen, whatever the frustration, will work to minimize the damage of divisive debates and votes and, where possible, to reverse the decisions. In the long run, moreover, the fostering of peace, economic and social development, and human rights by the United Nations system will depend not upon votes on specific issues but rather upon, in the words of the Charter, "harmonizing the actions of nations in the attainment of these common ends."

A TIME FOR LEADERSHIP

In this critical period of confrontation, the United States Government, the principal founder and long-time leader of the United Nations, must once again assume responsibility for making the system work. In our view, several actions are urgent.

1. Our Government should take the initiative in consulting with the other developed countries about reducing the economic imbalance between the developed and developing countries and encouraging a continuing dialogue between them. Ambassador Scali initiated this dialogue on January 29, when in an address at Boston he called for "a two-way exchange" in "a new spirit of constructive compromise."

2. Our Government should insist upon the principle of full participation of all Member States in the United Nations and other organizations, even those Member States whose policies may be generally unacceptable.

3. Our Government should urge all United Nations organs to respect the Charter and to observe "due process" in both substantive and procedural matters, in order to avoid hasty decisions and allow time to consult, to obtain legal advice, or even to request an advisory opinion from the International Court of Justice before acting.

4. Our Government should, while engaging in bilateral and regional diplomacy wherever necessary and appropriate, develop the practice of multilateral diplomacy in fostering the basic principles of the United Nations Charter, in avoiding acrimonious debates and divisive confrontations, and in developing and strengthening mediation and conciliation in the United Nations.

5. We appeal to President Ford and Secretary Kissinger to reaffirm, in deeds as well as in words, the determination of our Government to continue support for the entire United Nations system and to restore American leadership in every assembly, council, and governing body.

6. We appeal to the Congress to continue its legislative and financial support of the entire United Nations system and to maintain, and where feasible to increase, the contributions to United Nations programs.

7. We appeal to other non-governmental organizations and to the media to continue, and where possible to increase, their dissemination of information about developments in all the agencies of the United Nations system.

8. We endorse the position of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, which, while critical of the resolutions adopted by the General Conference, urged that "United States scholars, artists, scientists, educators and others continue to participate in UNESCO activities . . .".

9. We appeal to the American public to continue their support of the entire United Nations system, to renew their faith in the principles of international law and order, and to work, together with all other peoples, toward the building of a peaceful and prosperous world community.

ARTICLE ENTITLED "CLASH OF THE 'TWO MAJORITIES'—WHOSE UNITED NATIONS?" BY HON. CHARLES W. YOST, THE NEW REPUBLIC, DECEMBER 28, 1974

(By Charles W. Yost)

In an address to the United Nations General Assembly in December the U.S. representative John Scali spoke bitterly of the "tyranny of the majority," noted that "every majority must recognize that its authority does not extend beyond the point where the minority becomes so outraged that it is no longer willing to maintain the covenant which binds them," and concluded that in consequence of recent majority behavior in the Assembly, American support of the United Nations "is eroding—in our Congress and among our people."

Somewhat similar speeches were made on the same day by representatives of France, Britain, West Germany, Italy, Sweden and Belgium.

What occasioned this concerted outburst of indignation by the developed countries? Their frustrations have been building up for some time but were confirmed this year by actions of the majority on these subjects: international economic relations, South Africa and the Palestinians.

As to the first, the assembly adopted by a vote of 120 to 6 a "Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States" proposed by the President of Mexico. Among the handful of negative votes were those of the U.S., West Germany and Britain, and among the few abstainers Japan, France and Canada. In other words this is a charter that asserts the rights of the less developed countries and the duties of the developed but does not, in the view of the latter, adequately protect their rights or the interests of their private investors. As Ambassador Scali said: "the minority which is so often offended may in fact be a practical majority, in terms of its capacity to support this organization and implement its decisions."

On the second subject, a proposal to expel South Africa from the United Nations under procedures laid down in the U.N. charter was vetoed in the Security Council by the U.S., France and Britain. The Assembly majority thereupon proceeded to deny the South African delegate his seat in the current Assembly on very dubious procedural grounds.

Finally, and this action was the most provocative, the Assembly majority voted that, for the first time in the history of the organization, a spokesman not representing a member government might participate in an Assembly debate. This spokesman, moreover, Yasir Arafat, leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization, was accorded the honors not merely of a delegate but of a chief of state. To add insult to injury the Israeli representative, who wished to rebut seriatim his numerous adversaries in the debate, was prevented from doing so by a ruling of the Algerian Assembly president, which when challenged was upheld by the majority.

Coincidentally the same majority in UNESCO, the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which is supposedly nonpolitical, cut off support for regional programs in Israel on the grounds that Israel, in defiance of U.N. injunctions, is altering the physical and cultural character of Jerusalem.

These were the actions that the Western ambassadors so rigorously attacked and that provoked such angry reactions among press and public in several countries. For example Switzerland reduced its contribution to UNESCO by 10 percent, and on December 10, 71 U.S. senators joined in declaring the PLO a "direct threat" to the foreign policy of the United States.

Were these strong reactions justified? To some extent they certainly were. But in fairness to the Third World majority their intemperate actions, rather than

being matched by equally intemperate Western responses, should be examined dispassionately and with some perspective. In order to do so one needs to cast a glance at recent history.

First, as Ambassador Scali reminded his audience, the U.N. Assembly is not a legislative body. It cannot enact laws. Except in regard to internal procedural and budgetary matters, its resolutions are not binding on member states. What they are is a public expression of the opinions of a majority of member governments, in many though not in all cases representing a large majority of mankind. As Dag Hammarskjöld used to say, the Assembly is "a reflection of the world as it is," not as we might like it to be. In that sense it is worth listening to, if we wish not to deceive ourselves about the state of the real world. Adlai Stevenson once remarked in this connection that what the United States needs most is a hearing aid.

Second, we should not forget that from 1945 to 1960 the overwhelming majority in the United Nations consisted of Western Europeans and Latin Americans. Those were the days when the Soviet Union and the few nonaligned member states repeatedly protested "the tyranny of the majority." But we had then no qualms about passing resolutions over their strong objections. Now the shoe is on the other foot, and we are crying foul.

The history of the three issues that have provoked the present excitement also needs to be kept in mind.

Ever since the less developed countries became the majority they have been passing resolutions calling on the rich to assist much more substantially in their development, to improve the terms of trade that have until recently been heavily in their disfavor, and to police multinational corporations, which they believe have in many cases exploited them. The fact that there has been only a very modest response to these repeated appeals accounts in substantial part for the recent quadrupling of oil prices by OPEC, for the wave of nationalizations of foreign properties, particularly in Latin America, and for the one-sided resolutions on these subjects adopted by the U.N. Assembly.

As to South Africa, it should be recalled that the Assembly and the Security Council have for many years been passing resolutions, which the U.S. has almost always supported and only two or three states have opposed, calling on South Africa to abandon its policy of apartheid or racial segregation.

Yet practically nothing has happened. Apartheid remains as firmly entrenched as ever. Efforts to impose sanctions on South Africa or to expel it legally are blocked by vetoes in the Security Council. The procedural device adopted to deprive South Africa's delegate of his seat in the present Assembly was, therefore, while legally improper and politically unwise, a symbolic expression of long pent-up frustration on an issue that deeply affronts the human dignity of all the non-white members of the United Nations.

The questions revolving around the Palestine Liberation Organization likewise raise issues carrying an enormous emotional charge; there is no doubt that, just as much of the world community experienced a deep sense of guilt for having failed to prevent the holocaust of the Jews, so have many, particularly in the Third World, felt a growing sense of guilt for having allowed two generations of Palestine refugees to pass their lives in economic squalor and a political vacuum. A very large majority of U.N. members now clearly feels that, just as Israel is entitled to self-determination, independence and secure sovereignty, so too are the Palestinians.

Had this problem been squarely faced and decisively dealt with some years ago, it might have been resolved within the framework of the Jordanian state. Having been neglected too long, the initiative passed, as has been the case in many other emerging nations, into the hands of ultra-nationalists and revolutionaries willing to use terror to achieve "liberation." Outrageous as terrorism is, we must not forget that it has been used in similar struggles by French revolutionaries, Russians, Yugoslavs, Israelis, Algerians and many others, and is even now a daily practice among both Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland. This does not excuse it but helps explain why it is tolerated. To the great majority of U.N. members, Arafat is the fighting leader of an oppressed people, and it was in that capacity that he was recognized and honored.

Even the many who do not consider these explanations and parallels sufficient excuse for "irresponsible" behavior by the General Assembly would do well to recall the not insignificant accomplishments of the United Nations, not those of the distant past but those of 1974.

Valuable U.N. peacekeeping capabilities have again been demonstrated in the Middle East by the establishment of multinational forces in the Sinai and on the Golan Heights, forces that now play an important part in maintaining the fragile peace in the area and that, if there is to be a political settlement, will no doubt be an indispensable element in it. Moreover the Soviet Union has in this case for the first time joined in creating and paying for such a force and is co-chairing the U.N.-sponsored Geneva Conference. Through the U.N. it is thus deeply and usefully involved in the peacemaking process. A similar U.N. force in Cyprus was helpful in preventing last summer's conflict from doing even more harm than it did and remains a partial barrier to further hostilities.

Even the General Assembly, so bitterly reproached for one-sidedness, has during the past month upheld the U.S. position by narrow margins on two critical Asian issues: the representation of Cambodia and the maintenance of a U.N. command in Korea.

Of far more long-range significance were three U.N. conferences held this year on matters of profoundest import: the law of the sea conference in Caracas, the population conference in Bucharest and the food conference in Rome. It is true that none of these did more than begin to resolve these problems—by defining their magnitude, by proposing and debating means of dealing with them, and by exposing clearly the disastrous consequences of failing to cope. But had the United Nations and its family of economic agencies not existed, it is doubtful that even this beginning would have been made.

It is indeed in this economic area of urgent international concern that the future indispensability of the United Nations most probably lies, even more than in its traditional peacekeeping role. It is becoming ever clearer that the survival of organized and civilized human society into the 21st century depends on controlling population growth, assuring adequate and accessible supplies of food, fuel and fertilizer, developing and modernizing the underdeveloped two-thirds of mankind, rationalizing and stabilizing our trade and financial systems, protecting our threatened environment.

All of these are problems that affect all nations and their solution will, in this age of accelerating interdependence, require the active cooperation of most of them. The focus of such cooperation can best be international organizations in which almost all nations are present. To quote Hammarskjöld again, if the U.N. did not exist we would have to invent it. It will be simpler to preserve and improve it than to reinvent it. But it cannot be improved without patience, restraint, mutual accommodation and shared leadership on the part of all concerned.

These qualities will be required both from the numerical majority of Third World countries and what Ambassador Scali called the "practical majority" of those countries on whose economic, political or military power usually depends whether U.N. resolutions are mere empty gestures or lead to consequential action.

Rather than trying to reserve decision-making on these critical issues for a "rich man's club" of affluent states, the "practical majority" must, if it wishes the decisions to be carried out, submit them at an early stage to a forum of all concerned. To the same end the "numerical majority" must forego the symbolic "triumphs" that so provoke and alienate their powerful partners, must be less compliant to the small coterie of radical activists within their group, and must engage systematically in a far more persistent search for consensus among the two "majorities."

Finally, however, let it be clearly remembered what the General Assembly is and what it is not. It is a sounding board, a spectacular global opinion poll, a "face the world" talk show. It is not a parliament to pass laws or coerce its members. When decisions need to be taken by the United Nations they will be taken, in regard to the maintenance of peace, by the Security Council, where the U.S. and four others have a veto, and in regard to the critical issues of economic interdependence, in the specialized agencies and conferences, few of whose decisions can in fact be implemented without the support of those possessing, in each case, the relevant economic resources.

My concluding piece of advice to both "majorities" would be that of Talleyrand to diplomats: "*Surtout, pas trop de zèle*"—above all, not too much passion. The United Nations belongs to everyone, that is, everyone willing to live in peace with his neighbors.

ARTICLE ENTITLED "THE UNITED NATIONS WAS NEVER MORE RELEVANT
THAN TODAY," BY HON. CHARLES W. YOST, THE SATURDAY REVIEW,
JANUARY 1975

I

The outstanding fact about the United Nations today is that it is not being sufficiently used. It is our greatest underemployed international resource.

Our world is each year being drawn closer together by the reach of modern weapons, the nature of modern communications, the needs of expanding populations for food and fertilizer, and the demands of expanding consumption for energy and raw materials.

Even the strongest and richest nations, like the United States, are dependent on other nations for security and for maintenance of living standards. The poorest nations are dependent on others for bare survival.

Much of this interdependence, many of these requirements for greater security and assured supplies, could be satisfied through the United Nations if the capacities of its organs and agencies were adequately used. They never have been. In fact, during the past ten years they have been less used by the United States than ever before.

II

The United Nations was conceived in 1945 by Franklin Roosevelt and Cordell Hull because they believed that American isolationism after World War I had proved contrary to U.S. national interests. Our isolationism contributed to bringing on a second world war which we otherwise might have been able to prevent. Roosevelt and Hull did not want to repeat that mistake after World War II. They looked on a strong international organization as the best means of involving the U.S. durably and constructively in world affairs.

Moreover, they knew that, while sovereign nations would long remain the main actors on the international scene, the old balance of power system had failed to prevent two world wars and could not be counted on to prevent a third and a fourth. In a world exposed to nuclear weapons this prospect was wholly unacceptable.

III

The United Nations system Roosevelt and Hull established was also designed "to achieve international cooperation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural and humanitarian character."

This design was fleshed out in succeeding years by the creation of a vast network of associated agencies in these fields: for example, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, the International Monetary Fund and World Bank, the International Labor Office, the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the U.N. Development Program, the U.N. Environmental Program and the U.N. Population Program.

In so doing the founding fathers perhaps built better than they knew. Whether or not they foresaw that the world would thirty years later be caught up in a population crisis, a food crisis, an energy crisis, a monetary crisis, a raw materials crisis, they provided the instruments through which these crises could be dealt with internationally. The trouble is, as we have said, that these instruments are being only half used, and less used by the United States than by most other nations.

IV

That has not always been the case. During the first two decades of the U.N., the United States provided much of the necessary inspiration, leadership and resources. Most of the agencies listed above were set up at our initiative. Even now we continue to have more influence in the U.N. than any other single nation.

However, during the past fifteen years U.N. membership has grown much more numerous and diverse. There are now 138 members of which over 90 are so-called non-aligned countries from Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The U.S. therefore is no longer able to obtain U.N. approval of action which does not have wide support among the non-aligned. Sometimes resolutions are pushed through the Assembly which we strongly disapprove. However, it is important in this connection to emphasize two points.

First, the United Nations is not a world government. Far from it. It is an association of sovereign states with significant but strictly limited powers. Its General Assembly acts by majority vote but, except in budgetary and administrative matters, can only *recommend*. Its Security Council can *decide* on action to counter threats to peace, but in the Council the U.S. and four other permanent members have a veto. The U.N. cannot therefore dictate to the U.S.—nor to anyone else.

Second, the United Nations reflects the world as it is. Whether or not this is a sensible arrangement, there are more than 130 independent nations. We cannot ignore them or get along without them. A war in the Middle East, for example, threatens peace between the U.S. and the Soviet Union and lead to an embargo on our vital oil supplies.

Examples could be multiplied. We must in the interests of our own security deal with everyone else and we can usually do that best through an organization where most everyone else is represented.

Our Government in recent years has not seemed to understand this simple fact. It has talked a great deal about "a structure of peace" but has neglected the structure which is already there, the one we ourselves created.

What our Government has been talking about for the most part is the old balance of power. It has tried to pour the new wine of a global society into the old bottles that served Metternich and Bismarck in Victorian times. It has based its so-called "structure of peace" on fleeting personal relationships rather than on established and durable international institutions. That strategy simply will not work in the 1970's.

V

The members of the United Nations, when they signed and ratified its Charter, conferred upon its Security Council "primary responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security." Yet it has been the habit of most states, particularly the great powers, to seek security unilaterally or by military alliances, and to turn to the Security Council only at the last moment when war had already broken out or was imminent. Under these circumstances it is no wonder the Council sometimes "fails."

In 1971 the great powers, including the United States, resisted for months efforts of the Secretary General and others to bring the developing conflict between India and Pakistan before the Council. When war broke out, to no one's surprise, the U.S. Government publicly blamed the U.N. for failing to stop it. By using the U.N. as a scapegoat for its own mistakes, our Government unjustly and irresponsibly damages the U.N.'s public image and weakens its public support of the United States. There have unfortunately been far too many examples of such behavior.

The United Nations has not yet been provided by its members with the powers and resources to prevent all wars, but it has prevented many and it could prevent more. It can do so, however, only if the impending conflict is submitted to it for judgement and action in time, before public passions and military momentum have reached the point of no return. The Security Council needs a standing watchdog committee, like the Environment Program's world weather watch, to survey accumulating storms threatening the peace, to conciliate and mediate among those nations responsible and, if necessary, to bring them to the Council before, not after, the bell tolls.

Similarly, when cease-fires have been imposed and wars temporarily stopped, members of the Council must not simply put the issue on ice and hope it will stay frozen. It rarely does. War has been stopped four times in the Middle East, three times in the Indian subcontinent, three times on Cyprus, but each time, since the basic issues had not been settled, it soon broke out again. Its members must enable the United Nations not only to stop wars but to make peace, peace that will be definitive and durable.

VI

The U.S. Government has displayed a similar inclination to deal with the new problems of economic interdependence through ad hoc blocs, in which only consumers are represented, rather than through U.N. bodies where everyone is. It practically ignored the special session of the U.N. General Assembly on raw materials last April, finally presenting a unilateral proposal the day before adjournment. It has used the rostrum of the U.N. to berate the oil producers but rarely its chambers to negotiate with them.

Our Government has during recent years systematically neglected the vital interests of the vast majority of nations in the Third World. Our aid program has been steadily declining in volume and scope, and what remains has been overwhelmingly for the benefit of a few client states like South Vietnam and South Korea. It is not surprising, therefore, that the majority of poor nations at recent U.N. conferences, such as those on the law of the sea and on population, seemed unresponsive to our interests. Cooperation is a two-way street.

In general our Government has availed itself to a minimum degree of the opportunities which the U.N. system offers for dealing with global problems which critically concern our national interests. The following are some of the principal ways in which we could do so.

VII

1. The United Nations could and should play a much more active role in the peaceful settlement of international disputes which might otherwise lead to war. Significant means of doing so are provided in the Charter and have been further developed in U.N. practice over the past 25 years. Far too often these means have not been used at all or have been used too late to prevent war. Cease-fires are not enough. No conflict is ever settled until a durable peace, accepted in good faith by the parties, has been agreed and implemented.

2. The United Nations could and should, under U.S. leadership, play a much more active role in peacekeeping, that is, in placing forces or observers between contending parties until pacific settlements can be made. When the U.N. has been authorized to engage in peacekeeping, as in the Congo, Cyprus and the Middle East, it has usually succeeded, but both large and small nations still too often prefer unilateral adventures to multilateral peacekeeping.

3. The proliferation and burden of armaments, both nuclear and conventional, is one of the greatest threats to global security and progress. The waste of resources is enormous and inexcusable. None of the big powers is sufficiently using the several U.N. conferences and bodies charged with negotiating limitation and reduction of armaments. Conventional arms control is being almost entirely neglected. These problems cannot be resolved exclusively inside the U.N., but neither can they be resolved exclusively outside.

4. The second greatest threat to mankind's future is the pressure of growing population on finite and diminishing resources. Population growth is mainly occurring in the underdeveloped countries and only they can control it, though developed countries can help. The U.N. has for several years had a Population Program and in 1974 has held a Population Conference. Progress at the Conference was meagre because of a debate among participants as to whether economic development or population control should come first. This was pointless. Each is essential to the other. They must go forward together.

5. The most vital natural resource is food. Critical shortages, leading to widespread famine are likely to occur within the next year or two. The U.N. has also held a World Food Conference this year. As the leading producer and consumer of many staple foods, the U.S. has an interest in helping to expand food production in countries with rapid population growth and, as the nation with the largest food consumption and largest food surpluses, an obligation to contributing to alleviate famine when it occurs. Both of these tasks can best be carried out through impartial U.N. agencies.

6. At the special Assembly session this year the U.N. began to organize means of dealing with global raw materials problems. For the most part, however, production, marketing and consumption of such materials continues to be unplanned and unregulated, to leave producers and consumers alike at the mercy of ups and downs in supply and price, to risk widespread economic disaster and rapid depletion of exhaustible resources. Such problems can be effectively met only by international agreements in which all or most nations participate, such as those the U.N. can provide.

7. Substantial increments to essential world supplies may be found in the sea and seabeds. At the same time unrestricted national competition to exploit these resources could lead both to their early depletion and to serious international conflicts. The U.N. has held this year a conference on the Law of the Sea, which will be continued next year. Progress so far has been disappointing, partly because of a lapse of leadership on our part. It is in the vital interest of all nations, large and small, to ensure that the conference next year succeeds.

8. The world monetary system is in great disarray. There is no present assurance it can cope with the strains produced by global inflation and the sudden accumulation of huge new payments surpluses and deficits. Common action in and through the International Monetary Fund offers the best prospect of avoiding widespread economic depression.

9. It will be impossible to obtain the cooperation of the underdeveloped countries in resolving problems of population, food and raw materials unless the rich countries contribute much more substantially to their economic development. The experience of 25 years has shown that this contribution can be made with less political involvement and embarrassment through multilateral programs. The U.S. must expand the volume of its development assistance and direct a larger proportion of it through such U.N. agencies as the World Bank and its affiliates, the regional development banks, the U.N. Development Program, and the relevant U.N. specialized agencies.

10. Mankind has only just learned that its environment is not indestructible and that irreversible damage to it is already occurring. Since much of the environment is international, its protection also must be. At the Stockholm Conference in 1972 the U.N. established an Environmental Program which monitors emerging dangers to the international environment, advises governments what is occurring and assists them in preventive action. This Program deserves strong U.S. support.

Finally, what is the cost of all this to the U.S. and others? The total annual budget of the U.N. and its whole family of agencies is only \$1.3 billion, less than half of one percent of the U.S. budget, no more than the cost of a single Trident submarine. The U.S. contribution to the total U.N. budget is approximately \$40 million, less than half the cost of the New York City police. This would hardly seem extravagant for an organization with these vast responsibilities, which Adlai Stevenson called "the last best hope of mankind."

VIII

We live in a world of nations which are politically independent but otherwise more and more dependent on each other, in many cases for security and even survival, in all cases for economic stability and progress.

Under these circumstances a strong international organization, capable of peacemaking, peacekeeping and control of armaments, equipped to deal with global economic and environmental problems, is more and more in the national interest of every nation, including our own.

Such an international organization, the United Nations, has existed for nearly thirty years but has never been used to anywhere nearly its full capacities. There are many ways in which the U.N. can and should be improved, but it cannot be improved if it is ignored or neglected.

In this era of inescapable interdependence among all nations, rich and poor, strong and weak, right and left, an institution embracing all of them, given power and means to cope with problems and avert disasters threatening all of them, is more and more indispensable.

The United States, in the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt and Adlai Stevenson, in association with all our fellow passengers on this small and fragile planet, must seize the opportunities the U.N. offers to meet those problems of the 1970's and 1980's which are insoluble by any other means.

LETTER FROM ROBERT Y. GROMET, M.D., WORLD FEDERAL AUTHORITY
COMMITTEE, TO CONGRESSMAN DONALD A. FRASER, DATED FEBRUARY 1,
1975, IN SUPPORT OF A FEDERALIZED UNITED NATIONS

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRASER: Unable to testify in person at your forthcoming hearings, I hope this letter stating my views will be included in the Hearing Report.

I trust that during this bicentennial celebration of our independent nationhood, when we recall our own experiences under the weak Articles of Confederation which compelled us to invent our more perfect *federal* union, we have achieved enough maturity not to contribute further to the weakening and possible destruction of the United Nations until we replace it with a more responsible and effective federal structure.

But while we keep this United Nations system afloat for the present, let us move full speed ahead to develop a more perfect world union.

To this end, I urge that your Committee recommend that the United States participate in the forthcoming Charter Review Conference which was voted by the United Nations General Assembly this last December. (The United States most foolishly opposed it.)

Further, I urge that your Committee be constituted a Subcommittee on United Nations Charter Review and funded to undertake documentation, research and drafting of a World Constitution for a federalized United Nations, with popular representation in the General Assembly (based on one or more formulas of weighted representation) and with world laws enforceable on individual world citizens. This involves the pooling and transfer of authority over world affairs. National governments, including our own, have more than enough to do to cope with national affairs.

At long last, I want to see our Congress take this signal initiative in harmony with our historic record in developing the world's first effective federal system.

MATERIAL SUBMITTED BY THE U.S. NATIONAL
COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.S. NATIONAL
COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

(With name and title of representative)

1. American Academy of Arts & Sciences (Dr. J. Robert Nelson, Dean, School of Theology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02130).
2. American Anthropological Association (Representative not appointed at present).
3. American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (Dr. Cyril C. Ling, Executive Vice President, American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036).
4. American Association for the Advancement of Science (Representative not appointed at present).
5. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (Dr. Richard J. Brown, President and Director, Nicolet College and Technical Institute, Room 518, Rhinelander, Wisconsin 54501).
6. American Association of Museums (Dr. Kyran M. McGrath, Director, American Association of Museums, 2233 Wisconsin Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20007).
7. American Association of School Administrators (Mrs. Barbara A. Sizemore, Superintendent of Schools, District of Columbia Public Schools, Presidential Building, 415 12th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20004).
8. American Association of University Women (Mrs. Elizabeth (Kit) Wallace, 165 Marion Avenue, Mill Valley, California 94941).
9. American College Personnel Association (Dr. William Harold Grant, Director, Student Development, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama 36879).
10. American Council of Learned Societies (Dr. H. Field Haviland, Jr., Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts 02155).
11. American Federation of Arts (Mrs. Elizabeth (Betty) Blake, 3806 Beverly Drive, Dallas, Texas 75205).
12. American Field Service (Dr. Stephen H. Rhinesmith, President and Executive Officer, American Field Service, 313 East 43rd Street, New York, New York 10017).
13. American Folklore Society (Representative not appointed as yet).
14. American Geological Institute (Dr. Laurence L. Sloss, Professor of Geology, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois 60201).
15. American Institute of Architects (Mr. Louis A. Rossetti, President, Rossetti Associates, 1234 Penobscot Building, Detroit, Michigan 48326).
16. American Institute of Biological Sciences (Dr. John F. Reed, Professor of Ecosystems Analysis, University of Wisconsin, College of Environmental Science, Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301).
17. American Library Association (Miss Esther Jean Walls, Associate Director, Library, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, New York 11794).
18. American Political Science Association (Dr. Gene M. Lyons, Professor of Government, Dartmouth College, Silsby Hall, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755).
19. American Psychological Association (Dr. Nicholas H. Hobbs, Provost, Vanderbilt University, 212 Kirkland Hall, Nashville, Tennessee 37220).
20. American Sociological Association (Dr. Harry Alpert, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and Provost, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403).

21. Association of American Geographers (Dr. Marvin W. Mikesell, Professor of Geography, Department of Geography, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637).

22. Association of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association (NEA) (Mrs. Erma Williams, 2819 East Meyer Boulevard, Kansas City, Missouri 64132).

23. Association of College Unions—International (Mr. Clark E. Drummond, Director of Student Union, Wilder Hall, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio 44074).

24. Associations of Student International Law Societies (Mr. Jay A. Burgess, Attorney-Adviser, Near East and South Asia Division, General Counsel's Office, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. 20520).

25. Commission on Voluntary Service and Action (Mr. James Neal Cavener, 266 Ninth Avenue, Upland, California 91786).

26. Council on International Theatrical Events (CINE) (Representative not appointed as yet).

27. Four H Clubs (Mrs. Frances (Sue) Benedetti, 305 Seventh Street, NE., Washington, D.C. 20002).

28. General Federation of Women's Clubs (Mrs. Helen A. Tunkis, 573 Este Madera Drive, Sonoma, California, 95476).

29. International Association for the Exchange of Students for Technical Experience, Experience, Inc. (Mr. Robert M. Sprinkle, Executive Director (IAESTE/U.S.), American City Building, Columbia, Maryland 21044).

30. International Studies Association (Dr. Edward Miles, Professor of Marine Studies, Institute for Marine Studies, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195).

31. International Theatre Institute of the U.S.A., Inc. (Representative not appointed as yet).

32. League of Women Voters (Mrs. Gail Bradley, 2507 Sevier Street, Durham, North Carolina 27705).

33. Linguistic Society of America (Dr. Eric P. Hamp, Professor of Linguistics, University of Chicago, 5828 South University Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637).

34. Music Teachers National Association (Dr. Celia Mae Bryant, Professor of Music, University of Oklahoma, 560 Parrington Oval, Norman, Oklahoma 73069).

35. National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council (Dr. Cyrus Levinthal, Professor of Biology and Chemistry, Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University, 754 Schermerhorn Extension, New York, New York 10027).

36. National Assembly of Community Arts Agencies (Dr. Mark Ross, Executive Director, Arts and Humanities Council of Tulsa, 2210 S. Main Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74114).

37. National Association of Broadcasters (Mr. Daniel W. Kops, President, Kops-Monahan Communications, Inc., 152 Temple Street, New Haven, Connecticut 06510).

38. National Association of Education Broadcasters (Mr. William G. Harley, President, National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036).

39. National Congress of Parents and Teachers (Representative not appointed as yet).

40. National Council for the Social Studies (Dr. Stanley P. Wronski, Professor of Education and Social Science, College of Education, University of Michigan, 513 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, Michigan 48822).

41. National Council of Churches of Christ (Mr. William C. Walzer, Executive Director, Department of Education for Mission, National Council of Churches of Christ, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10027).

42. National Council of Jewish Women (Mrs. Shirley Joseph, 50 DeVille Circle, Williamsville, New York 14221).

43. National Council of Negro Women (Representative not appointed as yet).

44. National Education Association (Representative not appointed as yet).

45. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs (Mrs. Jeanne C. Squire, Secretary-Treasurer, Merrick Chevrolet Company, Berea, Ohio 44017).

46. National Federation of Music Clubs (Mrs. M. Nancy Pope, Cimarron Riverside Ranch, Loyal, Oklahoma 73756).

47. National Science Teachers Association (Dr. James V. DeRose, Head, Science Department, Marple Newtown Schools, Newtown Square, Penn.).

48. National Trust for Historic Preservation (Mr. James Biddle, President, National Trust for Historic Preservation, 748 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006).

49. National University Extension Association (Dr. Robert F. Ray, Professor and Dean, Division of Extension and University Services, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52240).

50. National Urban League (Mr. Cecil R. Forster, Jr., Vice President, Westinghouse Broadcasting Learning and Leisure Time, 90 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10016).

51. National Wildlife Federation (Mr. Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Vice President, National Wildlife Federation, 1412 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20036).

52. Nature Conservancy, The (Dr. Robert E. Jenkins, Vice President, The Nature Conservancy, 1800 North Kent Street, Arlington, Virginia 22209).

53. Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc. (Mr. Jerome E. Vogel, Executive Director, Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc., 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10011).

54. Public Broadcasting Service (Representative not appointed as yet).

55. Social Science Research Council (Representative not appointed as yet).

56. Student National Education Association (Representative not appointed as yet).

57. United Nations Association of the U.S.A., Inc. (Mrs. Sarah Goddard Power, 12 Ridgeway West, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104).

58. Women's American ORT (Organization for Rehabilitation through Training) (Representative not appointed as yet).

59. Young Men's Christian Association, National Council of (Dr. Nicholas T. Goncharoff, Executive Director, International Education and Cultural Affairs, National Council of the YMCA, 291 Broadway, New York, New York 10007).

60. Young Women's Christian Association, National Board of the (Mrs. Peggy P. Patterson, 5834 Morningside Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75206).

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND MEMBER-AT-LARGE
MEMBERSHIP IN THE U.S. NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

1. The Honorable Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510 (Federal Government).

2. Mrs. Shirley Temple Black, 115 Lake View Drive, Woodside, California 94062 (State and Local Government).

3. Mr. Sammy Davis, Jr., 1151 Summit Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210 (Member at Large).

4. The Honorable Robert J. Dole, United States Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510 (Federal Government).

5. Mr. Richard J. Elkus, Post Office Box 432, Redwood City, California 94064 (Member at Large).

6. Mrs. Lois Logan Evans, 133 East 64th Street, New York, New York 10021 (State and Local Government).

7. The Honorable William D. Ford, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515 (Federal Government).

8. The Honorable George J. Feldman, 1010 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10028 (Member at Large).

9. Mr. Robert R. Garvey, Jr., Executive Secretary, Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, 1522 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20240 (Federal Government).

10. Mrs. Rosemary L. Ginn, 303 West Boulevard, South, Columbia, Missouri 65201 (Member at Large).

11. Mr. Waverly Glover, Certified Public Accountant, 5406 Jamestown Road, Springfield, Ohio 45502 (State and Local Government).

12. Mrs. Katherine Goodwin, Assistant Director of Development, Public Broadcasting Co., WDCN, Nashville, Tennessee 37221 (Member at Large).

13. Miss Nancy Hanks, Chairman, National Council on the Arts, and National Endowment for the Arts, 806 15th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20506 (Federal Government).

14. Dr. Paul Robert Hanna, Professor Emeritus, Stanford University 94305 (Member at Large).

15. Dr. Robert E. Hill, Executive Director, National Center for Voluntary Action, 1625 Massachusetts Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20006 (State and Local Government).

16. Miss Paula Jewell, Howard University, Office of the President, 2400 6th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20001 (Member at Large).

17. Mrs. Mary Neal Jones, 2400 NW. Grand Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73116 (State and Local Government).

18. Mr. James Keogh, Director, U.S. Information Agency, 1750 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, D.C. 20547 (Federal Government).

19. Dr. Allan K. Kuusisto, President, Hobart & William Smith Colleges, Geneva, New York 14456 (State and Local Government).

20. Mr. Arthur Gordon Linkletter, 8530 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, California 90211 (Member at Large).

21. Mr. Benjamin F. Marsh, Ritter, Boesel, Robinson & Marsh Law offices, 240 Huron Street, Toledo, Ohio 43604 (State and Local Government).

22. The Honorable Frank Marsh, State Treasurer, Capitol Building, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509 (State and Local Government).

23. Mr. Frank C. P. McGlinn, 729 Millbrook Lane, Haverford, Pennsylvania 19041 (State and Local Government).

24. Mr. George W. Miller, Jr., Supervisor, Electronics Engineer, USACC Agency—White Sands, White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico 88002 (State and Local Government).

25. The Honorable Emil Mosbacher, Jr., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10022 (Member at Large).

26. Mr. Lauren D. Rachlin, Rachlin and Rachlin Law Firm, 1212 Genesee Building, Buffalo, New York 14202 (Member at Large).

27. Dr. G. Robert Ross, Chancellor, University of Arkansas, 32nd and University Avenue, Little Rock, Arkansas 72204 (State and Local Government).

28. Mr. Edward O. Sullivan, 51 Pondfield Road, Bronxville, New York 10707 (Federal Government).

29. Miss Jayne W. Teagle, 210 East 68th Street, New York, New York 10021 (Member at Large).

30. Mr. Lowell Thomas, 24 East 51st Street, New York, New York 10022 (Member at Large).

31. Mr. Russell E. Train, Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, D.C. 20460 (Federal Government).

32. Dr. R. Miller Upton, President, Beloit College, Beloit, Wisconsin 53511 (Member at Large).

33. Mr. George A. von Peterffy, Vice President, Kidder, Peabody, Inc., 10 Hanover Square, New York, New York 10005 (Member at Large).

34. The Honorable Charles R. Weiner, U.S. District Judge, U.S. Courthouse, 9th and Market Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107.

[From the UNESCO Courier, January 1975]

A STATEMENT ON ISRAEL BY AMADOU MAHTAR M'BOW, DIRECTOR GENERAL OF UNESCO

Reports carried by press, radio and television on recent decisions by the eighteenth session of the General Conference of UNESCO concerning Israel have frequently been lacking in accuracy and even objectivity.

Two resolutions adopted by the General Conference chiefly concern Israel: the first refers to the composition of regional groups set up within the Organization; the second refers to the protection and preservation of the cultural heritage in Jerusalem.

Because the resolution defining regions with a view to carrying out activities of a regional character has been interpreted incompletely or incorrectly, it has been maintained that Israel has been excluded from UNESCO or denied the possibility of participating in its activities.

Israel has neither been ousted from UNESCO nor from any regional group within the Organization. Israel continues to be a member of UNESCO, as one of the 135 Member States, which make up the Organization.

Israel also continues to be listed, for elections to the Executive Board in Group I (Western Europe) on the same footing as Australia, Canada, the United States of America and New Zealand, which are situated geographically outside of Europe.

During the eighteenth session of the General Conference, Israel, like Canada and the United States of America, introduced a draft resolution with a view to being included in the list of countries entitled to participate in the European regional activities in which the representative character of States is an important factor. While the resolutions referring to Canada and the United States were adopted, the one tabled by Israel was rejected by the General Conference, that is, by the duly accredited representatives of the governments of the Member States of UNESCO.

Thus, Israel is in exactly the same situation it was in prior to the eighteenth session of the General Conference. It therefore cannot be argued that it has been ousted from anything at all; the only new fact is that Israel is now the only Member State not to be included in one of the regions "with a view to the execution of regional activities", since Australia and New Zealand, at the proposal chiefly of five Asian countries, have been listed in the Asia and Oceania group, while Canada and the United States (at their request) have been listed in the Western European group.

Canada and the United States, I should recall, had requested—unsuccessfully—at the seventeenth session of the General Conference in 1972 to participate in the Second Conference of Ministers of Education of European Member States. At that time nobody, either in Canada, or the United States, much less in Europe, accused UNESCO of having excluded them from any regional group whatsoever. Thus, these countries have, like Israel, taken part in the conference held at Bucharest in December 1973 as observers. This possibility is open at all times to Israel should a ministerial conference again be convened in Europe. In the same way, Israel can participate as an observer, as it has done in the past, at any regional conference of ministers no matter where it is held.

The second resolution "invites the Director-General to withhold assistance from Israel in the fields of education, science and culture until such time as it scrupulously respects the resolutions and decisions" of the Executive Board and the General Conference.

This resolution is based essentially on resolutions 2253 of 4 July 1967 and 2254 of 14 July 1967 of the United Nations General Assembly and resolutions 267 of 3 July 1969 and 298 of 25 September 1971 of the United Nations Security Council on the status of Jerusalem, as well as on the decisions of the UNESCO

General Conference at its fifteenth and seventeenth session and of the UNESCO Executive Board at its 82nd, 83rd, 88th, 89th and 90th sessions. When it adopted a new resolution, the General Conference considered that the Israeli Government had not heeded the urgent appeals made to it since 1968 calling on it to "desist from any archaeological excavations in the city of Jerusalem and from any modifications of its features or its cultural and historical character, particularly with regard to Christian and Islamic religious sites." Noting that the excavations and works were continuing which it considered susceptible of endangering the Christian and Islamic sites, the General Conference decided six years after issuing its first notification, to condemn the attitude of Israel, which it considered "contradictory to the aims of the Organization as stated in its Constitution . . ."

I wish to stress that in reaffirming all the prior resolutions concerning Jerusalem the General Conference again explicitly invited the Director-General to "continue his efforts to establish the effective presence of UNESCO in the city of Jerusalem."

Such are the facts. I hope they will permit the general public to form a fairer and more accurate opinion of the resolutions adopted by the General Conference at its eighteenth session. Similar decisions have been taken in the past without giving rise to the reactions of these last few weeks.

There has been reference to the "politicization of UNESCO", as if the agencies of the United Nations system had not in fact been born of a political determination to found a just and durable peace by contributing to the general progress of humanity and to strengthening understanding and cooperation among all peoples. UNESCO is composed of almost the same Member States as the United Nations. The delegates to its General Conference are government representatives. It is therefore natural that the problems which perturb the world today should find an echo there.

For my own part, as I had occasion to say at the close of the eighteenth session of the General Conference, I think that, in an Organization devoted to education, science and culture, we must avoid those conflicts which take on the character of systematic confrontations. We should perhaps also avoid the adoption of resolutions, even with large majorities, that could result in deep bitterness in certain quarters. The golden rule for an organization such as UNESCO should always be the search for a consensus through patient and open dialogue.

That is why, as the newly elected Director-General, who had not taken part in the discussions which went on long before my election, I indicated to the General Conference my firm intention—if so authorized—to speak out henceforth and whenever it is necessary, in order to try to reconcile different points of view so as to reach the widest possible agreement.

I therefore regret that on the basis of information which is to say the least incomplete and often distorted, certain eminent persons have thought fit to adopt such uncompromising attitudes, although thinkers and scholars might be expected to be more inclined to discussion and dialogue.

I think it is appropriate to recall that for nearly 30 years UNESCO has been engaged in a vast undertaking, in its fields of competence, with the help of men and women of all origins and all creeds for the good of the international community, and that today in the UNESCO Secretariat itself men and women from more than 100 Member States—including Israel—are joined in a common effort.

I am firmly convinced that it should always be possible for UNESCO—if only interested States agree to work along with it—to overcome the tensions which hinder international co-operation and understanding in its fields of competence. But this presupposes that the norms and rules established by the Organization should not be considered a dead letter each time they conflict with specific interests.

STATEMENT ENTITLED "WHAT, IN THE U.S. INTEREST, IS GIVEN UP
IN OUR REFUSAL TO CONTINUE AS A MEMBER OF UNESCO?"

1. UNESCO is a means whereby thousands of American citizens and hundreds of private organizations conduct their international business in education, science, and culture. Approximately 340 international nongovernmental organizations have some form of relationship with UNESCO. UNESCO is a relatively efficient convenience for these people and institutions, and provides facilities for their interchange. It would be inefficient and vastly more expensive for them to conduct their international business outside of UNESCO.

2. In calendar year 1974, nearly 400 American professionals were offered short and long-term international job opportunities by UNESCO. The United States is also the single, largest supplier of technical and scientific materials purchased by "soft currency" countries through the UNESCO Coupon Program. An estimated 370 American companies, universities, and professional institutions have been direct beneficiaries of this program in the amount of \$40 million.

3. The United States is pursuing steps to increase scientific and technological cooperation with Latin America. The National Science Foundation is using UNESCO's UNISIST Program (World Science Information System) as one of the elements in this cooperation. The UNISIST program will ultimately lead to a great deal of standardization in the scientific information field. A strong U.S. role in UNISIST improves the chances of these standards becoming accepted worldwide, leading hopefully to increased exports.

4. Another example is the United States effort to promote global concern with the human environment, which it pursued strongly at the 1972 Stockholm Conference. UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Program is one of the active international programs now in operation and one which has the support of almost all Member States.

5. UNESCO's International Geological Correlation Program, sponsored jointly with the International Union of Geological Sciences, focuses on fundamental problems of geology, with particular emphasis on effective exploration and assessment of natural resources. Since the United States imports large amounts of minerals, whose prices are constantly rising, any program that may lead to new discoveries is in the U.S. interest.

6. U.S. book publishing is estimated to be a \$5-\$6 billion industry and American publishers export between \$300 million and \$600 million in books annually (the figure varies because the Department of Commerce does not count exports of 250 pounds or less). The Universal Copyright Convention, adopted, under UNESCO auspices, helps to protect the interest of American publishers. The American library community, which numbers 22,000 public and university-level libraries and 77,000 school libraries, have access to UNESCO programs pertaining to standards for statistics and serialization, copyright, and book and library development projects. Moreover, the UNESCO-sponsored Beirut and Florence Agreements facilitate, respectively, the international circulation of visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific, and cultural character.

7. Some problems are so cast that no one nation can solve them alone. Oceanography is an example. Even the United States does not have the resources to collect all the necessary data. UNESCO's programs have been most useful in working out task-sharing arrangements.

8. Finally, withdrawal from UNESCO will destroy the web of relationships, built at the U.S. urging, within the U.S. educational community and UNESCO's key education sector. There are several hundred nongovernmental organizations, including the International Association of Universities, the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession (NEA affiliated), the International Federation of Parent Education, World Organization for Early Childhood Education, and International Federation of Modern Language Teachers. Each of these organizations maintains a mutual supportive relationship with UNESCO, provides observers to conferences, assists in conference plans representing their particular interests, and severing the UNESCO tie would isolate these hundreds of U.S. educational NGOs.

THE JOURNAL OF THE
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.

Subscription prices: Five dollars per annum in advance. Single copies, fifteen cents. Payment in advance. All communications should be addressed to the Editor, American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Entered as second-class matter, June 26, 1907, under post office No. 383, at Chicago, Ill., under special agreement of post office and inspectors. Accepted for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918.

Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Copyright, 1919, by American Medical Association. Printed at the American Medical Association Press, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918.

Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Copyright, 1919, by American Medical Association. Printed at the American Medical Association Press, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918.

Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Copyright, 1919, by American Medical Association. Printed at the American Medical Association Press, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918.

Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Copyright, 1919, by American Medical Association. Printed at the American Medical Association Press, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 16, 1918.

Postage paid at Chicago, Ill., and at additional mailing offices. Postmaster: Send address changes in this journal to American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., U.S.A.